FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 036 24 February 1986

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Editorial Article Advocates Chemical Weapons Ban AA 1
[IZVESTIYA 24 Feb]
Editorial Article Views U.S. Attitude on Test Ban AA 3
[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]
'Nothing Constructive' in U.S. Response to Proposal AA 6
[Kalyagin]
Falin Demands 'Substantive' U.S. Response AA 7
[IZVESTIYA 21 Feb]
U.S. Conducting 'Miniaturized' Nuclear Tests AA 9
[PRAVDA 22 Feb]
U.S. Embarking on Course to Violate ABM Treaty AA 10
[IZVESTIYA 21 Feb]
Space Arms Group Holds Meeting in Geneva AA 10
Strategic Arms Group Holds Talks in Geneva AA 10

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' CC 1
[Grigoryev, Tsoppi, Charikov]
PRAVDA Editorial Article on USSR Quest for Peace CC 8
[24 Feb]
Deputy Foreign Minister Discusses Asia Policies CC 9
[MTI]
GDR Assembly Delegation to FRG Issues Communique CC 12

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Press Conference Discusses U.S. 'Neoglobalism' A 1
U.S. Plans 'Armed Operations' Around World A 3
[Seyful-Mulyukov]
Report, Comment on Reagan's Grenada Trip A 4
New Threats Issued A 4
U.S. 'Betrayal, Perfidy' Decried [Fesunenko] A 4
'Strange Logic' Noted [Legantsov] A 5
U.S. Judgment of Nicaraguan Revolution Criticized A 6
[Fesunenko]
Angola Next Target of U.S. 'Neoglobalism' A 7
[Kalyagin]
Weapons 'Already Delivered' A 8
Commentary Examines U.S. Aid A 8
U.S. Planning Military Aid to Chadian Government A 9
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Feb]
Tension Serves U.S. Interests [Kulik]
U.S. Military Presence in Indian Ocean Decried A 10
TASS Notes Politicizing of Shuttle Mishap [Ignatyev] A 11
Pentagon Out To Gain Control of Shuttle Program [Borisenko] A 12

CHINA

Ilichev Talks With PRC Ambassador in Moscow B 1
[IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]
Embassy in Beijing Marks Soviet Armed Forces Day B 1
Xu Xin Attends Reception B 1
Soviet War Dead Honored B 1
PRC To Try Hijackers of Soviet Plane B 1
RENMIN RIBAO Cited on 1946 Events in PRC B 2
[IZVESTIYA 21 Feb]
Commentaries Note U.S. Threat to Asia, PRC B 2
New Weapons Given to Taiwan [Volskiy] B 2
U.S. Policy 'Hostile' to PRC [Losev] B 3
TRUD Examines PRC Urban Housing Problem B 4
[Piskunov, 20 Feb]
PRC Chief Meteorologist Visits 7-17 Feb B 5

NORTHEAST ASIA

Maneuvers Reveal Japanese Military Ambitions C 1
U.S. 'Spy Planes' Intrude Into DPRK Airspace C 1

SOUTH ASIA

U.S., Not USSR, Blocking Settlement in DRA D 1
[Kalyagin]
Baluchistan Poverty Linked to U.S. Military Bases D 1
[Malik]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Reportage, Comment on Philippine Developments E 1
U.S. 'Intervention' Condemned E 1
Marcos Cited on Rebellion E 1
'Peaceful Means' 'Exhausted' E 1
Marcos Stance; U.S. Interference E 2
Reagan Statement Constitutes Interference E 3
State of Emergency Declared E 3
'Transitional Government' Formed E 3
Lomeyko Describes U.S. Interference E 3
Philippine Elections Haunt U.S. E 4
[Kalyagin]
Pressure Reaches 'Climax' E 5
[Demchenko in PRAVDA 21 Feb]

EASTERN EUROPE

CSSR's Husak Supports Soviet Arms Proposals F 1
[PRAVDA 18 Feb]
PRAVDA Carries Ryzhkov, Messner Dinner Speeches F 1
Ryzhkov Speech [21 Feb] F 1
Messner Address [21 Feb] F 3
Messner Seen Off at Airport Departure Ceremony F 6
[IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]

WESTERN EUROPE

UK Radar Station Upgrade Violates ABM Treaty G 1
[Sayenko]
U.S. Dictates FRG Stance on Arms Proposals G 1
[Grigoryev]
Missing USSR Embassy Staffer Sought in Greece G 2
[Athens ATHENS NEWS 20 Feb]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Bovin Stresses Senselessness of Gulf War H 1
Iraqi Ambassador Confers With Lushev in Moscow [INA] H 1
Gulf Conflict, Yemen Situation Examined [Zholkver] H 1
PDRY Minister Discusses Soviet 'Experts' Return [Aden] H 2
Soviet Solidarity Delegation Arrives in Libya H 3
[Aslanyan in IZVESTIYA 21 Feb]
Soviet Official Views Cooperation With Kuwait [KUNA] H 3
PLO Official Ends Soviet Foreign Ministry Talks H 4
[Baghdad Voice of PLO]
Syrian, Soviet Oil Relations, Promotion Discussed H 4
Envoy Briefs Al-Jumayyil on Soviet Stand [Beirut] H 4

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

U.S. May Use Chemical Weapons Against Nicaragua K 1
[Podolnaya]

EDITORIAL ARTICLE ADVOCATES CHEMICAL WEAPONS BAN

PM232018 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editorial article: "Banning Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] The world public and political and scientific circles throughout the world are continuing to study the Soviet state's large-scale, peace-loving proposals promulgated in the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary. This package of peace proposals, which is designed to promote a radical improvement in the international situation and to help free mankind from the threat of nuclear, chemical, and other wars, is in the interests of the whole of mankind. The proposals made in the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement encompass all of the most important aspects of arms limitation and disarmament.

First and foremost, it is essential to free mankind from the threat of nuclear war. The Soviet Union proposes in the next 15 years -- by the beginning of the next century -- to carry out the elimination of nuclear weapons on earth; the deployment of space strike armaments being inadmissible.

The complete elimination of chemical weapons, which have already killed tens of thousands of people and maimed millions, is a vital task in the disarmament sphere. The use of chemical weapons today could result in the destruction of enormous numbers of people, particularly civilians, and, possibly, the whole of mankind.

"The Soviet Union considers it entirely realistic to completely eliminate now, in this century, such barbaric weapons of mass destruction as chemical weapons," the statement says. Specific proposals made by the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in recent years, as well as the new proposals contained in the above-mentioned document, are aimed at resolving that task.

From the earliest years of its existence the Soviet Union has fought to ban these dreadful weapons and was one of the first signatories to the 1925 Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous, or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare. Since then it has rigorously observed its international commitments and, true to the Geneva protocol, it has never resorted to the use of chemical weapons anywhere or handed them over to other countries. Despite persistent pleas to sign that important document, the United States did not do so until 50 years later, in 1975, having perpetrated a number of crimes involving the use of chemical weapons in Southeast Asia prior to that.

The 1925 Geneva protocol, however, while it outlawed the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons, did not ban their development, manufacture, or stockpiling. Continuing its struggle to remove these means of mass destruction from military arsenals, the Soviet Union, in conjunction with the other socialist countries, presented a draft convention on the simultaneous banning of chemical and bacteriological weapons to the United Nations in 1969. The United States, however, blocked the document's adoption.

On the initiative of the socialist countries a Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction was signed. It came into force in 1975. Chemical weapons, however, remained in national arsenals.

Continuing its struggle to improve the international situation, the Soviet Union, together with the other socialist countries, submitted a draft in 1972 for a corresponding international convention to the Geneva Disarmament Committee (since 1984 the Disarmament Conference) for its examination.

The Soviet leadership also managed to persuade the U.S. Administration to begin Soviet-U.S. talks with the aim of drawing up a joint initiative on the question of banning chemical weapons and destroying stocks of them. Quite considerable progress was made at those meetings, which began in 1976. However, in 1980 the United States unilaterally broke off the talks. Continuing to pursue a policy of goodwill, in 1982 the Soviet Union submitted the draft "Basic Provisions on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction" to the United Nations.

The discussion of that document, augmented and broadened in 1983-1985 by new proposals from the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, including proposals on questions of verification [Kontrol], now occupies a central place in the Disarmament Conference's work in Geneva.

Simultaneous with the talks on a global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons at the Geneva conference, the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries have also been conducting vigorous work to ban chemical weapons on a regional scale. On 10 January 1984, for example, the Warsaw Pact states proposed to the NATO states that talks begin on banning chemical weapons on a narrower plane, that is to say, on ridding Europe of these weapons. Thus far, this constructive proposal remains unanswered. But the socialist countries hope that reason will prevail and that talks will begin.

In 1985 the Soviet Union supported joint GDR-CSSR proposals regarding the creation of a chemical weapon-free zone in central Europe.

Last December our state supported and approved proposals by Bulgaria and Romania on creating a chemical weapon-free zone in the Balkans also.

Thus, the Soviet Union has proposed a whole series of approaches to the United States and the other NATO countries whereby it would be possible to initiate the process of drafting a document which would subsequently lead to the conclusion of an international convention on banning chemical weapons and on their destruction.

The new proposal proposed by the Soviet Union has considerably concretized and broadened our approach to questions of banning these barbarous weapons of mass destruction. What is the stance of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact states as a whole?

They continue to advocate a global and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons and the earliest destruction of all facilities where they are manufactured. For the implementation of effective and reliable verification [kontrol] to ensure that the above-mentioned measures are fulfilled, the Soviet Union is ready to ensure the prompt declaration of the location of all enterprises producing chemical weapons.

True to the spirit of the 22 Novmeber 1985 Soviet-U.S. statement, which urges "stepping up efforts to conclude an effective and verifiable [poddayushcheysya kontrolyu] international convention," the Soviet Union proposes that the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, which began its work this year, proceed to draft a procedure for the destruction of the corresponding production base. It is planned to proceed with the elimination of the stockpiles of chemical weapons shortly after the international convention comes into force.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement, in addition to the radical resolution of lethal chemical means and their destruction, also proposes a number of, so-called, interim steps. Such could be, for example, multilateral accords on the nontransfer of chemical weapons to any other party and on the nonemplacement of them on other states' territory.

In its approach to banning chemical weapons the Soviet Union allocates a special place to questions of verification [kontrol]. The Soviet Union, no less than any other country, has an interest in ensuring that monitoring is both reliable and strict. As M.S. Gorbachev observed at a reception for the heads of diplomatic missions accredited to the Soviet Union, "Let it be verification [kontrol] using national technical means of international verification [kontrol]; the sole proviso is that it should be verification [kontrol] of the observance of specific accords." Our stance on the question of verification [kontrol] is therefore simple and specific: All measures to implement future accords must be carried out under strict verification [kontrol], including international procedures for on-site inspection [proverka].

How does the United States respond to this appeal? So far, it has to be regrettably stated, it has not adopted a constructive stance on banning chemical weapons. Moreover, under pressure from the military-industrial complex and the hawks, the Washington administration is openly seeking congressional approval for new appropriations to further improve chemical weapons and switch over to mass production of the new generation of chemical weapons -- binary chemical ammunition.

This course is patently at variance with the mood of the world public and the stance of the majority of the world's states, which unanimously favor the banning of chemical weapons and the destruction of all stockpiles of them. What all those who cherish peace demand is the elimination, not the expansion of chemical arsenals. The Soviet Union's new peace initiatives are also directed to that end.

EDITORIAL ARTICLE VIEWS U.S. ATTITUDE ON TEST BAN

PM221738 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Editoral article: "Washington at the 'Moment of Truth'; How the United States is Responding to the Soviet Moratorium on Nuclear Explosions"]

[Text] The unilateral Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions has been in force for 7 months now. And the peoples have been waiting for Washington to join Moscow's initiative for 7 months.

But the United States increasingly does not deem it necessary to pool efforts with the Soviet Union in order to end nuclear explosions. Just what is preventing the United States from backing up in practice the widely proclaimed statements about its love of peace and ardent desire to save mankind from nuclear weapons? Washington has many answers to these questions.

"Answer" one. The USSR's decision to introduce a moratorium straight off without delay was called "propaganda." That assessment turned out to be inapplicable. Moscow proposed: "If everything we do is just seen as propaganda, why not respond to it along the lines of 'an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'? We have stopped nuclear explosions. And you, Americans, should take revenge by doing the same." As revenge, however, there was another underground explosion in Nevada. It was followed by others. But since then there has been no mention of "propaganda." Preference is given to other "arguments."

"Answer" two. R. Perle, U.S. assistant secretary of defense, stated last summer: "The Russians cannot be trusted. They have already violated a moratorium once." But the U.S. press reminded the untrusting "historian" that, to put it mildly, he was confused. Indeed, the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution 31 March 1958 on the unilateral ending of tests on all types of nuclear and hydrogen weapons and called for the other nuclear powers to follow this example.

The Soviet Union only released itself from this commitment 30 August 1958, some 4 months after Washington and London in response to the Soviet appeal had launched (in April that year) the most intensive nuclear test programs that had been held until then.

Things would seem to be clear. But time passes -- and in the second half of January 1986 L. Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, repeated Perle's pearls: "We are suspicious of Soviet moratoriums on tests because in the past the Russians have proposed moratoriums and broken them themselves." Is this obdurate ignorance or just deliberate slander? -- It is hard to say, but to all appearances, it is an "answer" that suits its authors.

"Answer" three. They try to make it easier to wander down paths of pseudohistoric excursions in the campaign against the moratorium by climbing on the old hobbyhorse of "verification [kontrol] difficulties." But that horse was worn out before it started. For Moscow proclaimed: "We state categorically that verification [kontrol] is no problem for us. If the United States ends all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis, the proper verification [kontrol] of the observance of the moratorium will be completely ensured by national technical means and with the help of international procedures -- with on-site inspections [inspektsiya] if necessary."

You cannot be clearer than that. However, time passes -- and at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, which recently resumed work, the U.S. delegation arrived with the same aim: "There are differing opinions on whether effective inspection [proverka] means exist." That is an old tune. And it is being played in the old style.

"Answer" four. Properly speaking, it is not one reply, but a whole series including the following "thesis": "The Soviet test program was basically complete at the end of that part of the year when they announced the introduction of their moratorium." This "argument" did not last long. The Soviet Union explained: "It was by no means easy for us to take this step. In order to introduce a unilateral moratorium it was necessary to break off the test program before it had been completed." But Washington got out of that also.

It was already January 1986. At one of his press conferences Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, not without malicious pleasure, rebuked Moscow: "They have prepared superbly for resuming tests on the day after the moratorium expires." That was said on virtually the same day that the Soviet Union stated: "We are extending our unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions by 3 months... The moratorium will stay in force if the United States, for its part, also ends nuclear tests."

Having familiarized himself with this decision, L. Speakes, White House deputy press secretary "understood" it himself -- and shared his discovery with journalists: "The Russians have the advantage and at the present moment do not need to hold tests." Gee, "those Russians"! They are slippery customers! They do not have to push ahead towards a conclusion of a strategic arms modernization by using nuclear explosions, thus building up the "Soviet threat" to United States which is at a disadvantage; they can just scoff -- they have the advantage and are prepared to wait a whole 8 months for the United States to catch up...

One excuse is more convincing than another. The chief of the U.S. military department even went so far as to declare: "The Russians do not hold tests at all at this time of year." Meaning that they wait until it gets warmer... But there are no grounds for rebuking C. Weinberger for his wild imagination. He himself obviously realized that trying to link the "start" and "end" of test programs is a thankless venture and so he switched to calculating "totals," as they say.

The results were not long in coming; soon the defense secretary declared: "The Russians have much more modern arms... They have held an enormous amount of tests."

To the uninitiated this answer may sound entirely convincing. But the initiated spend their time guessing: What amounts are we talking about? If we take the period between 1 January and 6 August 1985, it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union by no means outstripped the United States in terms of numbers of tests. If we take the entire postwar period, it turns out that the United States has held approximately 40 percent more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union, and 70 percent more when the other Western countries are included. So, if we copy the head of the U.S. military department and take the number of tests as a criterion of "threat" [ugrozhayemost], it is the West rather than the "Russians" which has far more "modern arms."

But a quantitative criterion is not the most reliable one in this specific case. Here facts of a different kind are far more trustworthy. And according to them (despite all of the Reagan administration's efforts to "steal a march" on the Soviet Union in its pursuit of indisputable military superiority and despite the U.S. Defense Department's vain attempts to portray the Soviet Union as "shooting far ahead"), the maintenance of rough parity in nuclear armaments between the two powers ensured by the Soviet Union has been and remains the reality. This was also confirmed in the Senate on 5 February by such an authoritative specialist as Admiral Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It is therefore not at all a question for the United States of the number of nuclear tests or nuclear armaments. What then is it?

Just a day after the promulgation of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's 15 January statement, THE WASHINGTON POST carried an article which said that "Officials have reported that the Reagan administration will not alter its position regarding the necessity of continuing tests." Why "necessity"? What precisely is it about the situation which forces Washington to talk of necessity when the Soviet Union in the self-same situation not only does not feel any "necessity," but indeed, approaches the question of nuclear tests from a position which is the exact opposite of that of the Americans?

Answering questions put by L'HUMANITE, M.S. Gorbachev described the Soviet program proposed in January for a world free of nuclear weapons as follows: "These proposals represent a kind of 'moment of truth.' They are making our negotiating partners reveal their true face and show what kind of goals their policy is really pursuing." What, then, does Washington's policy look like at this "moment of truth"?

As far as its attitude to the proposed Soviet moratorium is concerned, it is easy to see that the Washington administration does not, of course, have a single argument against joining the moratorium which convinces the peoples of the world.

Nor is it difficult to see another thing. Namely, that the United States, forced by the Soviet Union's comprehensive peace initiatives to confront the 'moment of truth," is having to acknowledge the following with increasing frequency and candor: Yes, the renunciation of nuclear tests is undesirable for Washington, since it does not correspond to long-term U.S. arms.

The preparation of more and more new kinds and types of nuclear weapons with increasing lethality and destructiveness lies at the core of this "constellation" of goals. Washington's cherished "star wars" program is an organic element of those goals. If the United States renounced nuclear tests, it would be deprived of the opportunity of developing [razrabotki], testing, and deploying space strike armaments based on the principle of nuclear-triggered laser systems. And space weapons by themselves, as is now already obvious, are not only not intended to "eliminate nuclear arms," as the White House claims, but are designed to maintain them. After all, the elimination of nuclear arsenals by as early as the end of the present century, as the Soviet Union proposes, will make space systems simply unnecessary. Washington does not want to recognize this. But it is going to have to.

Submitting the draft Pentagon budget to the Congress recently, the U.S. secretary of defense said: "The United States is at the present time beginning to act from a position of strength; it is in fact the only way to conduct talks effectively."

The chief of the military department does not yet, of course, represent the whole administration. But for some reason no refutations were heard of this infamous panegyric to the "position-of-strength policy." Nor were any attempts by the people to somehow dissociate themselves from the future course outlined by Weinberger recorded. Hence the question: How does this course square with R. Reagan's repudiation in Geneva of a desire to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union?

Analysis of the "arguments" presented to the world from the banks of the Potomac convincingly demonstrates that U.S. reluctance to join the moratorium on all nuclear tests declared and extended by the Soviet Union is nothing more than a manifestation of that desire: The desire to be capable of casting the peoples into the abyss of the very thermonuclear catastrophe to whose inadmissibility the White House today gladly gives verbal acknowledgment, while the Soviet Union is seeking to prevent it by deeds.

[This article is accompanied by a diagram containing information on "the number of nuclear explosions as of 1 January 1986" based on "data from the Swedish Defense Institute."

The diagram lists totals for five countries as follows: United States -- 789; USSR -- 565; France -- 135; Britain -- 38; China -- 29; Total -- 1,556. A pie chart follows which converts these figures into percentages: United States -- 50.4 percent; USSR -- 36 percent; France -- 8.6 percent; Britain 2.4 percent; China -- approximately 2 percent.

At the end of the diagram is the statement: "In 1985 the United States carried out 18 explosions. (prior to the moratorium the USSR and the United States each carried out 9 explosions)."]

'NOTHING CONSTRUCTIVE' IN U.S. RESPONSE TO PROPOSAL

LD232145 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Over 5 weeks have passed since the publication of the Soviet program for delivering mankind from nuclear and chemical weapons in this very century. The world has grown tired of waiting for a U.S. response to our peaceful initiatives. Western observers write that the delay has been caused by disagreement within the U.S. Administration and that the Pentagon is putting the brakes on things.

In order to reach agreement with the allies on the U.S. counterproposals Nitze and Rowny, two high-ranking emissaries from the White House, have been on a trip around the capitals of several states in Europe and Asia.

Certain well-informed observers believe that the White House is going to give its response on the eve of, or even on the opening day of, the 27th CPSU Congress to insure that the Soviet Union is left with no time to react to the U.S. position in the political report at the congress. If this really is the case, it indicates yet again the lack of seriousness of the Washington administration and that it is more concerned with arranging propaganda contests than with really looking for paths to disarmament and peace.

So, as yet there is no official reaction from the United States, but it is being forestalled by U.S. observers' reports. The content of Washington's counterproposals has already become the property of the Western press. It is possible that these information leaks have come about deliberately to prepare public opinion.

How then does this response, which has been proposed, look? Even a cursory look at the White House position shows that there is practically nothing constructive in it. However, there is an obvious attempt by the U.S. President to create the appearance of a positive approach. In order to implement this design the Americans are dismembering the Soviet peace program, although it is presented as a single whole. The United States is picking out of it the parts which suit it best, casting the others aside. So, in principle, they agree to a 50-percent reduction in nuclear weaponry. It is true that they have their own way of understanding 50 percent, but they do not wish to renounce the Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan -- that is the "star wars" program which is undermining the very idea of reducing nuclear weapons.

The United States is also, it would appear, in favor of eliminating U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. But, at the same time they reject our proposal on freezing the corresponding British and French nuclear forces and on the United States not supplying its missiles to other countries. To justify this they say that freezing British and French nuclear arsenals runs counter to plans which they adopted earlier to modernize them and in particular, equipping the British Navy with new U.S. Trident missile-equipped nuclear submarines. The unacceptability of this approach is evident. The Soviet Union is proposing disarmament while the partners of the United States in NATO will increase their nuclear might. Furthermore, they are demanding that we eliminate half or even most of our medium-range missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union. In other words, the White House is as before adhering to its notorious zero option in only a slightly revamped form.

Let me repeat that our analysis is based on data in the U.S. press. As yet, there is no official response. One would like to think that it will be carefully thought out and constructive. To be sure, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev noted in his message to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, mankind has reached a turning point in its history where it must choose which path to follow next -- either to overcome the inertia of the past when security was seen primarily through the prism of positions of strength and military and technical decisions or to remain the hostage of the arms race, involving nuclear, chemical, and in the future, other no less threatening weapons.

A clear and consistent path was indicated in our 15 January statement. In particular, it envisages the destruction of all medium-range missiles in just the first stage of eliminating nuclear weapons. We attribute special importance to the problem of liberating Europe from nuclear weapons and primarily, from medium-range missiles which are seriously undermining European security. It only takes 8 minutes for a Pershing-2 sited in the FRG to fly to Soviet territory. As a result, the possibility of conflict coming about even accidentally is increased and at the same time, the people of West Germany have to play the unenviable role of nuclear hostages.

FALIN DEMANDS 'SUBSTANTIVE' U.S. RESPONSE

PM211514 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "There Must Be a Substantive Response"]

[Text] It is more than a month since the publication of the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Soviet Union's submission of a range of new foreign policy initiatives aimed at ensuring that mankind greets the year 2000 under peaceful skies and space, with firm confidence in its peaceful future.

These days a month is a considerable period. But the official West, usually so quick to react, is silent. Not counting a few courteous remarks.

Certain commentators claim that the Soviet proposals have pitched Washington into confusion and despondency. Saying "no" would mean acting the king with no clothes in public. Saying "yes" would be even worse: They would have to accept what the U.S. Administration has been avoiding like the plague for the last 5 years. There is only one way out -- to drag their feet and confuse the issue. A 17th century French thinker described this kind of action thus: "So-called know-alls like to be confused by what is clear and not to understand what is entirely obvious."

What do today's know-alls find unclear? They can in no way understand, you see, who would benefit from a world without nuclear and other types of mass destruction weapons. Washington's concern is to reduce other military potentials, but not its own. If the "perfidious Russians" advocate not only detente, but a detente that deprives militarism of a voice, then they are probably not doing it to harm themselves. What attraction would there be in a world in which the United States could not just take what its heart desired wherever its gaze alighted. The dollar, of course, does count for something, but its full weight is felt only when it is backed not merely by U.S. treasury assets, but by Pentagon cash. It is the latter that makes up for the "decaying" effect of equal rights.

Thus, an official reply is still awaited. Meanwhile, the Western public is being gradually prepared for that longest of journeys known in all languages as a "detour." A trip on post-horses, with many stops, far from the nub of the problems -- that is the approximate scenario.

Proposing nothing substantive for its part, Washington "will take note" of Soviet "concessions." The possibility of talks, specifically on concluding an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe, or accords on destroying chemical weapons or reducing conventional arms and armed forces must be conditional on Soviet readiness to accept a number of preliminary conditions imposed by the United States and its allies. The U.S. side intended to escape a ban on nuclear weapons and a timetable for removing them from states' arsenals with vague and entirely noncommittal arguments. Not everything is clear about tests. Rather, it is not clear whether any new arguments will be put forward to justify the rejection of a moratorium. But, first and foremost, Washington intends to avoid any linkage [vzaimosvyaz] between the limitation and reduction of strategic nuclear means and nuclear arms altogether and the nonsiting of strike systems in space. A piece of "diplomatic cunning" is permitted as an option -- the "star wars" topic will be omitted from the response. As if it did not already exist.

In other words, a classic deception maneuver is being hatched. It is meant to trigger a controversy and set the public guessing who is right and who is guilty, since not every specialist is capable of getting to the bottom of the problem. That is why particular hopes are being pinned on the external effect and on the trenchancy of formulas and expressions. The overall tone -- and U.S. envoys have been trying this out in West European capitals -- is that the Soviet comprehensive plan cannot be taken as a basis since it requires the breakup of NATO military doctrines and allegedly gives the Soviet Union unilateral advantages.

Prompted from overseas, the European NATO members -- some directly, others by allusion -- are looking for trickery primarily in our main proposal on the phased elimination of nuclear weapons. Their zeal in attempting to prove the impossibility and harmfulness of denuclearization [dezatomizatsiya] leads certain people into conflict with... Reagan. The President sings the praises of his "Strategic Defense Initiative" as the sole practical means of making nuclear weapons "obsolete and unnecessary." But FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner states: "I consider this to be an illusion."

"I think that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons as a result of the development [razrabotka] of SDI," the minister stresses, "is unattainable in the foreseeable future." Incidentally, U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger agrees with him.

Perhaps even stronger attacks are made on the idea of ridding Europe of nuclear weapons or at least, of certain nuclear weapons systems. To listen to certain figures it would seem that without nuclear arms the West's integrated defense would disintegrate into disparate unequal fragments. To the delight of the Soviet Union, "We in Europe," U.S. General Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander, said the other day, "should in no way be wanting a zero option in the nuclear sphere. For the destruction of medium-range weapons would mean that Pershing and cruise missiles would disappear from Europe, that is, there would not be any of the weapons which are the link between European and U.S. security, since only these medium-range weapons can reach Soviet territory." In order to rule out an interim solution beforehand, the United States is giving London and Paris promises ahead of time to promote the modernization of their nuclear arsenals and to be deaf to any proposals mooting British and French participation in international efforts to limit the nuclear arms race.

They are also laying a trap ahead of time for an agreement on reducing conventional arms and armed forces. With reference to Europe they allege that "geographic asymmetry" could be an insuperable obstacle. After all, in the event of complications the United States would have to ship heavy weapons from overseas while the Soviet Union, as a European country, would have them at hand. Soon they will be saying that, to play safe and "facilitate planning," the NATO strategists should be given a little extra to take account of the poor roads in the Soviet heartland, which have been so unwelcoming to uninvited guests in the past. In addition to the demands that are being made, two U.S. tanks would be equated to one Soviet tank and corresponding "asymmetrical counting" would be applied to all types of heavy arms.

I will not burden readers with details. The reaction at the "working level" is commensurate with the aggressive military doctrines of the United States and the NATO bloc as a whole and in line with the rejection of everything that formed the basis of mutual understanding in the seventies. Today Western rulers are not interested in concepts such as mutual benefit. It seems that they see their advantage mainly in placing the socialist countries at a disadvantage; whatever might give us balanced advantages is perceived as an encroachment on imperialism's position, a time bomb, or abandonment of the plans for social revenge. If they had their way, these rulers would long since have forced all peoples to learn by heart the U.S. or other versions of "democracy." Fortunately, they have been unable to achieve this for almost 70 years now.

What next? We can expect fierce opposition from the opponents of stopping the arms race. The peoples cannot achieve a single step toward lasting peace without a struggle. And that struggle consumes a great deal of time and effort. However, Washington cannot avoid a response, a substantive response, to the Soviet proposals and the questions posed by life itself -- the sternest judge in matters of what is true and false.

U.S. CONDUCTING 'MINIATURIZED' NUCLEAR TESTS

PM211713 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Widespread Support"]

[Text] Tokyo, 21 Feb -- The United States is not only refusing to join the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests, but is also conducting secret underground explosions in addition to those "officially acknowledged," according to the Japanese newspaper ASAHI.

Citing authoritative military experts, the newspaper reports that since the second half of the seventies the United States has been carrying out work to "miniaturize" nuclear weapon tests so as to make them virtually "imperceptible" to existing monitoring [kontroliruyushchiy] systems. According to figures from a private U.S. research organization, the council for the protection of natural resources, more than 10 "unofficial" underground nuclear explosions were carried out in the United States between 1980 and 1984 alone in addition to the "main" tests, which are usually officially announced.

As ASAHI points out, these explosions are being used in the creation [sozdaniye] of nuclear trigger devices for lasers, which the U.S. military is trying to use in the "star wars" program, and also in the development [razrabotka] of nuclear warheads for the lastest U.S. Trident-2 missile systems.

U.S. EMBARKING ON COURSE TO VIOLATE ABM TREATY

PM211143 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA press service report under the "Theme of the Day" rubric: "Unseemly Involvement"]

[Text] Reports have recently begun appearing increasingly frequently in the Western press providing evidence that right-wing political circles in the United States together with the military are working intensively to undermine the 1972 USSR-U.S. ABM (antimissile defense) limitation treaty. Back in October 1985 the Pentagon chief pronounced it "anathema" and revealed Washington's intentions: "We must examine the possibility of a real break with the ABM Treaty." C. Weinberger's report to Congress on the Pentagon's draft budget for fiscal 1986 published specific instances of gross violation by the United States of the spirit and letter of the ABM treaty. As the report pointed out, the construction of a phased-array radar station using solid-state elements will be completed this year at Thule in Greenland. The fundamental modernization of the Fylingdales Moor radar station (Britain) will begin.

The Fylingdales Moor station is part of an ABM early-warning system. Its modernization, according to Western press information, will considerably increase its range and observation zone. This move by Washington may be taken as nothing less than the creation of a radar field covering the entire country. In that even t he United States is entering into direct conflict with Articles III, IV, and V, of the ABM treaty. It is well known that this treaty bans the deployment of phased-array radar stations other than within the stipulated areas, at test ranges, and along the periphery of its national territory and oriented outward. The sides also pledged themselves not to create such stations outside their national territory. The United States has now adopted a course aimed at the direct violation of its international commitments. Britain's agreement to the above-mentioned work at Fylingdales Moor makes it an accomplice in the violation of the ABM Treaty.

SPACE ARMS GROUP HOLDS MEETING IN GENEVA

LD181245 Moscow TASS in English 1232 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 18 TASS -- The group on space arms at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons had a meeting here today.

STRATEGIC ARMS GROUP HOLDS TALKS IN GENEVA

LD191637 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Geneva, February 19 TASS -- The group on strategic armaments held its session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD232218 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 23 Feb 86

["International Observers Roundtable" with Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, TASS political observer; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, member of the editorial board of the weekly NOVOYE VREMYA; and Igor Pavlovich Charikov, foreign political commentator of the all-Union Radio.]

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! In 2 days on 25 February, the 27th CPSU Congress will open in Moscow. As you know, following wide discussion in party organizations and in the party press, this congress will adopt the draft of the new edition of the party program and also the changes in its rules. The draft of the Basic Guidelines for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and the Period through the Year 2000 will also be confirmed for acceptance by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The importance and the scale of these documents are self-explanatory. They also provide evidence of the fact that the congress itself will represent a major event, not only in party life, but also in the life of our entire state. It must be said that the foreign public too, is showing a great interest in the forthcoming congress. The Congress Press Center has told me that almost 500 foreign correspondents, representing major news agencies, television and radio companies, newspapers and magazines, will be reporting on its work. This interest can be viewed as recognition of the grandiose role played by the CPSU, the ruling party in our country, in international affairs.

Indeed, this is a major role. Let us just take the complex of measures aimed at reduction in stages and full destruction of all kinds of nuclear arms, which was put forward by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on behalf of the CPSU on 15 January this year. These initiatives have already been rightly appraised practically all over the world, because they affect the interests of all states and people, both large and small. Not a single bourgeois political party has acted in the world arena with such responsibility for the fate of the whole of mankind, or with such a concrete, well thought-out, realistic program for the transformation of our planet into a vast zone of peace.

The bourgeois parties in the major capitalist states, as a rule, confine themselves to solving domestic policy issues only; foreign political issues are set out in their programs and other documents by only general phrases with little specific content. A graphic example of this in particular is the foreign policy plank of the preelection platform -- that's what they call their program -- of the U.S. Republican Party, which was adopted at the national convention in the summer of 1984.

On foreign political issues, the CPSU acts not only on behalf of the Communists in our country, but it also expresses the interests of all the Soviet people. It is supported by the fraternal communist and workers' parties. The official friendly visit to the Soviet Union of Zbigniew Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, which took place last week, has yet again confirmed that People's Poland, as well as other fraternal socialist countries, have come out hand in hand with the Soviet Union and the CPSU for the practical solution of the cardinal task of the present time: halting the arms race, primarily the nuclear arms race. The radical solution of this problem has been proposed in the detailed program for the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of our twentieth century under the condition of banning the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment [razvertyvanie] of strike space weapons.

In his message to the participants at the regular session of the Disarmament Conference in Geneva, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emphasized that there is only one possible way of freeing mankind from nuclear threat, the direct way, by eliminating nuclear weapons themselves. He pointed out that the objective reality is such that the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of the "star wars" weapons will inevitably further the arms race in all directions. Therefore it is necessary to put strike space weapons under an effective international ban from the very beginning. Such an approach, as it is well known, has met with understanding in many Western state capitals. In the United States as well, there are many serious and level-headed political figures who are denouncing the Reagan administration's stubborness on the space weapons issue. As we are aware, however, the White House so far has not heeded public opinion, either domestic or from other countries, and continues to conduct its affairs toward the implementation of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. By doing this, it is generally increasing the complexity of the already highly complicated issue of the nuclear arms race limitation.

[Grigoryev] I would like to add several of my own thoughts and observations to what you said, Igor Pavlovich. The forthcoming 27th congress of our party is, indeed, drawing great attention worldwide and in a way, so to speak, it focuses world public attention upon our country, upon what is happening in our country, and upon its actions on the international arena. In practical terms, the forum of the Soviet Communists has already become, on the eve of its inception, a number one topic of foreign mass media.

For instance, five or six major Japanese papers have for several days now been serializing separate articles dedicated to the economic and social development of the Soviet Union on the basis of the well-known documents which were discussed in our country, as well as on the discussion of the foreign political course. I recently read an interesting observation in a report in the West German paper UNSERE ZEIT by its correspondent and foreign affairs editor Wolfgang Bruehel, who visited our country. He too, compares what he sees in our country with what is happening in his country, in his homeland. He writes: What I have been able to see now in the Soviet Union would be impossible in our country, in the Federal Republic. Our ruling parties have never dreamed about anything like this. Millions of people are discussing the party program as an affair that concerns them closely; they approve of it wholeheartedly because they know that this is the program of their life and their future. It is indeed so.

On the other hand, this enormous attention focused upon our country is naturally, let us say, not so straightforward. It is not simply positive, if I can call it that, because bourgeois propaganda remains bourgeois propaganda. Naturally, being forced to write and report in this or that way about events in our country, it uses all types of tricks to distort them, to jumble them somehow, to delude those whom it serves: the readers, viewers, and so on.

[Tsoppi] This is becoming more difficult. However, I think that it is documented by the fact that the American CIA for example has started to publish special daily reports on the happenings in the Soviet Union and to disseminate them among highly placed officials in Washington and among diplomats. This publication is dedicated to the pre-congress topics and above all to the internal problems of our state and our society. I think that such increased attention given to the happenings in the Soviet Union and to the happenings which will occur at the congress can, of course, be explained. The Leninist party is indeed at the present time guiding our country to a new frontier -- to the frontier of a revolutionary turning point. This concerns the basic restructuring and improvement of many aspects of production relations and hence of human relations in our country.

It also concerns the methods, forms, and style of the party and state leadership. This means politics in the highest and in the strictest sense of the word. This task is a truly revolutionary one, and it can be solved only by revolutionary disposed and revolutionary minded people. These people, the Soviet people, are responding to the appeal of the epoch, both as far as the development of our country and as far as international politics are concerned, bringing out proposals which are absolutely revolutionary at the present time and which you, Igor Pavlovich, have mentioned.

[Grigoryev] I would also like to make this point, that apparently, whether we like it or not, bourgeois propaganda is prepared at such crucial moments as the ones we are presently going through to erect barriers to true information about our country in their own areas, in their own countries. However, these barriers do ultimately let through, of course, little crumbs of information: only a little, but nevertheless they do let it through. It is interesting to take a look at the way those who make this propaganda try to adapt to the situation; try to say something that is apparently objective, apparently good, but at the same time to push through the very same ideas and the very same thoughts about us and about our country. I do not want to leave what I say unsubstantiated and I will give a concrete example. A few days ago, the U.S. ABC television company, one of the three major television companies in the United States, showed its viewers a report from Moscow by Threlkeld, a correspondent working here, which as he said himself was devoted to the Soviet people and its traditions. Just listen to a few quotes: The traditions of the Russian people, he says, came into being much earlier than did our own. Well, that's true. Their history is considerably richer. One cannot object to anything there, either. However it lacks epochs and events like the Renaissance or the appearance of the Magna Carta. We didn't have a Renaissance of great Russian literature and we didn't have the great charter of freedoms born of the October Revolution. He goes on and on in the same spirit.

[Tsoppi] As you have noted, Aleksey Nikolayevich, the greater the attention that is given to our country, the more acutely we raise problems and the greater the response encountered among the broad masses of the working people and the democratic circles, then the more colorful on the other hand is the rhetoric that is intended to act as a counterweight to our plans and our way of life and bring more deeply into the awareness of the American, the French and the West German philistine the firm impression that he is incomparably superior to us, to his contemporaries who live in the socialist countries. It is intended to develop in his consciousness a conditioned reflex of fear, mistrust, and chauvinistic instincts.

[Charikov] When you started to talk about ABC, I remembered that this same company is currently preparing a major television serial which is going to go under the name Amerika. It will deal with what America is like and how America will live after...

[Tsoppi interrupts] Ten years after it has been occupied by Soviet troops.

[Charikov] After occupation by Soviet troops! Can you imagine such nonsense! What sensible person is capable of simulating such a daft situation? Who? And why? What is this needed for? Why do adult, literate professional television journalists deliberately poison -- deliberately poison -- the atmosphere in relations between people?

[Grigoryev] It's clear: This freedom and independence and so on is the freedom of the purse that Vladimir Ilyich Lenin wrote about way back at the beginning of the present century. Here it is -- it is camouflaged, it does not declare itself, but it exists.

Nothing will be said by the editor or the journalists, be they television journalists or printed word journalists and so on, nor can anything be done by them if this offends the censorship exercised by the editor or the proprietor or other superior authority.

[Tsoppi] I think that the visit paid to Grenada last week by the U.S. President is a vivid enough illustration of U.S. adherence to the ideals of freedom and democracy. Let us recall that this island state has already been an occupied country almost for 2 1/2 years, a country occupied by Americans following their intervention there in October 1983. Why were the people of Grenada occupied? Simply because they chose the path of national independence and democratic development. Now the boss there is the U.S. ambassador. There is a harsh police regime on the island. In short, everything is better for the vital interests, not of the people of Grenada, but of the United States. What's more it's just the same in another Caribbean country, Haiti. His U.S. bosses managed to bring out Jean-Claude Duvalier, bloody fanatic and dictator, and get him to France on a U.S. military aircraft with the agreement of the Frence Government. In Paris they said that it was for 8 days. Nearly twice this amount of time has already gone by, and Jean-Claude is still living in clover on French soil surrounded by security men, surrounded by concern and cordiality. Not one single country in the whole world wants to give him refuge.

[Grigoryev] Incidentally -- and pardon me for interrupting -- but why shouldn't he be living in clover when he brought with him when he fled, and a little earlier, more than $500 million.

[Tsoppi interrupts] Yes, half a billion.

[Grigoryev continues]. Which can be compared to an annual budget of Haiti which amounts to $250 million. In other words, Baby Doc brought with him two annual budgets, leaving around a million dollars in the treasury.

[Tsoppi] Around a million dollars in all. So there is not one country that is willing to accept him. At one stage they said that Liberia, apparently, might take him in return for a respectable sum, though they evidently understood later that that would be an utterly provocative insult to the whole of Africa. Those behind the plan for settling Duvalier in Liberia rejected it.

Though in fact it isn't at all difficult to find a proper place for this man: his place is in the dock, best of all in Haiti itself, best of all in Port-au-Prince, its capital, where they haven't forgotten this perfectly terrible criminal. He has on his conscience the deaths of thousands, of tens of thousands of Haitians. He and his U.S. masters carry the responsibility for the monstrous poverty, hunger, and lack of rights of the people. There is no punishment that this pocket-sized fascist dictator does not deserve. But the fact is that having thrown out Jean-Claude, the Haitians have not yet got rid of Jean-Claudisme, as the doctrine and practice of this fascist regime have solemnly been called. The country is ruled by a junta which consists totally of his people who have undergone training in the United States. The army solicitously protects the sinister Tontons-Macoutes, which, translated from the Creole, means something like the Vampires. They continue to carry out bloody acts against a population that has risen in an insurrection of liberation against the fascist dictatorship, which served interests primarily of U.S. and French monopolies. In short, the situation there remains extremely tense, while Washington, with the tacit agreement of Paris, makes out that that is the way things have to be and that it is none of its business.

Furthermore, there is another part of the globe where the two imperialist countries are today cooperating.

They are doing so in a very active way, each pursuing its own strategic and other economic interests, and at the same time those that are shared between the two of them. I am thinking about all that is happening around Libya. For several weeks the United States has been terrorizing this country, accusing it of terrorism. The U.S. Navy, the Navy's air force, is persistently patrolling off the coast of Libya with blatantly provocative intentions. France, now, has essentially opened up a second anti-Libyan front, a land front, having carried out a massed military incursion into the territory of Libya's neighbor, Chad, and having reinforced the positions of the pro-Western regime in Ndjamena, the country's capital. It's as if they are taking Libya in a pincer-movement, and this is very serious and dangerous. In the view of democratic circles in France this operation, which has been given the frightening code-name of "Hawk", proves that Paris certainly isn't seeking to achieve national conciliation in Chad, something which, if it were achieved, would in general remove any pretext for foreign interference. This is first and foremost a blow struck against Libya and against the whole of Africa, against the Arab countries, done in order to remind everyone that France, with the complete approval of the United States, will continue to fill the role of armed gendarme standing guard over the imperialist presence on the black continent and in all places from which colonialists have at some time been driven out.

[Grigoryev] Perhaps it is worth mentioning in this connection how we view French imperialism, for what we are talking about is France, wonderful France with which we have such long-standing traditional links. But imperialism remains imperialism, and the fact that it is French imperialism does not mean that it has French elegance. It is just as crude and harsh as it always was.

[Tsoppi] What's more, this imperialism, with its crudeness and harshness, is today exceeding all bounds of decency, even in relation to our country. Just look: France today is breaking all the records for anti-Sovietism. All bourgeois programs contain absolutely vile reports that the normal mind simply cannot stand, which allegedly underline the life of the Soviet people. They try to distort our peace program. They try to present it as some kind of game, as some kind of contest between the two superpowers, and so on and so forth. This is something that strikes everyone, literally everyone.

[Charikov] We have just been talking about the possibility of national conciliation in Chad and about the way in which imperialist forces are trying to hamper this very normal process. I immediately started to think about the way something similar is currently taking place on the Korean peninsula. We know that the issue of the reunification of North and South Korea is on the agenda. It has never been taken off it. Recently the leadership of the DPRK, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, has taken an important and I would say constructive step toward the creation of a more constructive atmosphere for these talks. The leadership of the DPRK has proposed that all military maneuvers be ended by 1 February of this year on the territory of the peninsula, with the object, so to speak, of introducing into relations between the North and South an element of, say, confidence and stability. Naturally the leadership of the DPRK was counting on some actions in response by South Korea. However, South Korea's decision was made by the United States. At the very same time it began holding large-scale military games under the code-name "Team Spirit-86," thereby demonstrating that in the first place they are ignoring the DPRK initiative, and in the second place that essentially it is opposed to any compromise, that it is opposed to any reunification of the North and South of that country in any form. As we know, the United States is essentially the boss in the South. Following the so-called U.S.-South Korean treaty of 1953, the U.S. presence there is regarded as being essentially without time limit. Chon Tu-hwan, the current president, as we know took up this post in 1981, after a so-called new constituion was introduced for the country.

Under this constitution he was elected for a 7-year period, that is to say in 1988 he is due for reelection. What's more, he was elected not by direct suffrage but according the U.S. model by an electoral college. Given the fact that there is no direct suffrage, the result of this election is already under some doubt.

[Tsoppi] As we know, he himself primarily picked the electors with the help of U.S. advisers.

[Charikov] Not only the electors. Under that same constitution it turns out that the president has the right to appoint -- just imagine it -- to appoint one third of the national assembly, i.e. the country's parliament...

[Tsoppi interrupts] That is, the people who are to elect him.

[Charikov] Yes, the people who are to elect him, his country's parliamentarians.

[Tsoppi] That is also a very democratic method of government!

[Charikov] That is precisely the issue, and this democracy, this so-called democracy, is being promoted in all sorts of ways by the United States and presented as an example which should be followed in Asia.

[Grigoryev] Well, since we're talking about democracy, we naturally cannot fail to mention this concept in reference to Western Europe as well - to the bourgeois West. In the FRG at the moment, the government is trying to get through the Bundestag two internal security laws. I shall not go into the details of these laws, but their substance was very accurately expressed by the West German Communists' newspaper UNSERE ZEIT, which wrote that if these laws are adopted by the Bundestag, the FRG will finally be transformed into a police state. Well, indeed, things have been going that way for a long time, especially since the Christian Democrats and Free Democrats coalition came to power in 1982. The infamous constitution protection department has stepped up its activities. It has already passed a couple of million West German citizens through its filters in all sorts of interrogations and hearings and, according to the latest figures, around 10,000 West Germans have their names on the blacklist of those who are deprived of the right to work, to labor; i.e. the Berufsverbot, the ban on expression and ban on profession -- an expression which has entered all other languages from the German. Sad though it be, democracy in action, West German democracy, bourgeois democracy in action provides us with examples of this literally every day. Repression for participating in demonstrations is becoming harsher, as is police surveillance and so forth.

However, there is still another, let's say interesting phenomenon, which also characterizes this bourgeois democracy of the FRG very clearly. The other day it became known that none other than the chancellor himself, Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, is under investigation. The procurator's office of the city of Koblenz has instituted proceedings against him on a charge of giving false testimony at a sitting of the parliamentary commission for the investigation into the Flick affair. So, the charge has been made against him. It was made by Otto Schily, a Bundestag deputy from the Greens Party and a well-known lawyer. The charge is that what Kohl said was far from the whole truth, and, moreover, that it wasn't even the truth at all. Well, I don't want to make guesses now as to what the outcome of this investigation will be, although UNSERE ZEIT, which I mentioned earlier, wrote that if the judges perform their duty, the chancellor will have to resign from his post. Let's not make any guesses about this for the moment. I simply want to talk about the essence of this phenomenon.

Putting a brave face on a sorry business, the bourgeois press writes in the FRG about how democratic their society is: even the chancellor, who allegedly committed unseemly deeds, is standing trial. Well, it's true that the chancellor is standing trial, as formerly did Economics Minister Lambsdorff, who then resigned from his post, and Barzel, who resigned as Bundestag chairman. That is true, but after all the affair is not called the Kohl, Lambsdorff, or Barzel affair, but the Flick affair.

[Tsoppi] The owner.

[Grigoryev] The owner. Nothing, however, is being done about the owner. Admittedly he is a bit fed up with this press scandal. He went and sold the majority of shares in his concern for 5,000 million -- he doesn't want his name to be bandied about anymore. No judicial bodies at all are summoning him however, nor will any because he is the boss. In his time he has installed Mr X. Next there will be Mr. Y, and then Mr. Z. The whole system remains the same.

[Charikov] Kohl probably isn't in much danger.

[Grigoryev] Even if he is in danger, I repeat, even if he is in danger, the system is one in which politics are determined by a large monopoly, or rather large monopolies, a conglomerate of these monopolies: the same ones that once brought Hitler to power. Naturally, I am making no parallels with today's FRG; nonetheless, I want to point out that these concerns have retained all their power and they bribe politicians. That, then, is their democracy, founded on bags of money.

[Tsoppi] It is a democracy of which any normal person living in such conditions ought to be ashamed. In France recently there was an instance which was very unpleasant for France's reputation. A factory worker kept a diary in which he noted the way in which workers were treated, working conditions, why there are no labor protection measures, and so on and so forth -- how much the company is making out of exploiting the workers. He sent this diary to the French Communists' newspaper HUMANITE. It was published and Henri Clavot, as the man is called, was sacked for daring to think that he, simple worker, has the right...

[Charikov interrupts] To write to a newspaper.

[Tsoppi]... Has the right to freedom of speech, has the right to use the freedom of the press. I think that this defect is an innate feature of bourgeois democracy, and I see no way for a society in which such a democracy flourishes to get rid of it.

[Charikov] Yes, there are many examples in the West like the one you have just mentioned, Viktov Aleksandrovich. They all differ only in the extent of their dramatic character, one could say. At the same time, they all confirm, just as you said, the fact that the society which calls itself the society of freedoms, equal opportunities and democracy, in actual fact tramples on these freedoms every day and every hour. Admittedly, individual citizens such as these Flicks, Kohls, and so on enjoy freedom in that society, i.e. those who are in power. All the others -- the workers, all the other people, all the other ordinary members of that society -- do not, in fact, have these fictional rights, and in essence, do not enjoy these freedoms.

On that, allow me to say good-bye and to thank you on behalf of the participants in this broadcast. Good-by comrades, and all the best.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON USSR QUEST FOR PEACE

PM232030 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 86 First Edition p 6

[Editorial article: "Rising to the Challenge of the Epoch"]

[Text] The 27th CPSU Congress is awaited all over the world as a most important event not only in our country's domestic life, but also in international life. This appraisal stems from the revolutionary nature and scope of the tasks which Lenin's party has set itself, rising to the challenge of the epoch.

This is a dual challenge. From the viewpoint of the country's domestic life, it concerns the fact that Soviet society is now facing the task of decisively accelerating socioeconomic development. From the external viewpoint, the creation [sozdaniye] of highly efficient means for mankind's self-destruction brings to the foreground the need for fundamental changes in the sphere of international relations and for the renunciation of the practice, going back thousands of years, when states relied on military force and often set it in motion.

"We Soviet Communists," M.S. Gorbachev says, "have been and remain loyal to the immortal teaching of Marx and Lenin, which was born and developed as a revolutionary teaching, as an instrument for the profound transformation of the world in the interests of the working class and all working people, for the sake of satisfying their vital needs and implementing their social and moral ideals. And this means that we Communists must be masters of the art of always and everywhere applying this teaching skillfully and creatively to the specific conditions of our work and of the real world surrounding us."

This is exactly how Lenin's party acted in preparation for its congress. Political observers and even the broad public strata abroad are struck by its dynamism and the daring with which it is revealing the accumulated shortcomings, by the grandeur of the plans for creative activity set out in the precongress documents, and by the purposefulness embodied in the unity of domestic and foreign policy which supplement one another.

The world is living through a period of great hopes and great alarm. Never before in its history has mankind possessed such great opportunities to solve its problems. Never before, however, have its problems been as complex as at present.

The achievements of the scientific and technical revolution, undreamed of just a few decades ago, seem to have made our planet smaller with man's emergence into space -- the eyes perceive it as just a small blue sphere. How young this planet -- Earth -- still is, strictly speaking. Its actual formation is still in progress, as volcanic eruptions and earthquakes constantly remind us. But no matter how destructive nature's elements may be at times, it is not they that cause the main alarm of mankind. Its attention is concentrated on different problems -- social, economic, and political.

The invention of nuclear weapons and the prospect of the creation [sozdaniye] of other, even more devastating means of mass destruction, transform the idea of peaceful coexistence between states with different socioeconomic systems, which was propounded way back by V.I. Lenin, into an imperative necessity. There is no other sensible alternative for mankind. The strong-arm method of solving international disputes is fraught with the destruction of life on earth itself. Now the question of war and peace has become the main, the key problem of mankind.

It is profoundly significant that the first country of victorious socialism in the world, the one that was born with the slogan "Peace for the peoples!", has now put forward, under fundamentally different international conditions, an expanded program for the total liquidation of nuclear weapons and the prevention of the militarization of space.

This program is contained in M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement. Presented on the eve of the 27th CPSU Congress, it became yet another important landmark along the path of preparations for the congress and enhanced even further the international importance of the forthcoming forum of Soviet Communists. We believe that, having conquered the minds of people, from responsible statesmen to the most ordinary people, this program is capable of becoming the material force which will enable mankind to free itself from the fear for its future, to enter the 21st century without nuclear or any other mass destruction weapons, and to channel into peaceful needs the enormous funds that are being wasted on the arms race.

Such is the noble and humane objective set by the Land of October. It counters the misanthropic "star wars" plan being hatched by the most aggressive circles of U.S. imperialism with its own "star peace" plan, opening before mankind the truly boundless horizons of exploring the universe and of social progress.

The peoples in the world hope that the 27th CPSU Congress will make a weighty contribution to the cause of the implementation of their common dream of a peaceful and happy life. And their hopes will not be in vain. Lenin's party has risen to the challenge of the epoch and will meet it appropriately.

DEPUTY FOREIGN MINISTER DISCUSSES ASIA POLICIES

LD211208 Budapest MTI in English 1041 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 21 (MTI) -- Leonid Ilichev, deputy foreign minister of the Soviet Union, has given an interview to MTI's Moscow correspondent on the policy towards the Far East of the Soviet Union, including Soviet-Chinese relations.

Ilichev stated 'The Soviet Union is also an Asian and Pacific power, which has its longest border in Asia. Over the past years the militarist activity of imperialism has palpably strengthened in this region. The imperialist forces continue to increase military potential in the immediate vicinity of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states of Asia.

In this region, however, no steps were made to explore such efficient, comprehensive and mutually acceptable solutions as in Europe. A diplomatic 'gap' of this kind raises the danger of such events that might entail serious consequences for the Asian countries, and the entire world.

We oppose that the Asian states should become the 'nuclear hostages' of strategists beyond the ocean. We wish Asia to become a continent of peace and cooperation. The sooner it happens the better as the dangerous course of events can only be broken with steps made in that direction. The Soviet Union has expounded the basic conception of strengthening strategic stability which would comply with the interests of all countries in the region.

It would contain the five principles of peaceful co-existence elaborated by Asian countries, the ten principles of Bandung, and the proposals for security in Asia by the Soviet Union, Mongolia, the DPR of Korea, the Indochinese countries, India and other countries.

The Soviet Union does not wish to enforce ready formulas on the states of Asia and the Pacific region. It calls upon joint efforts to elaborate such formulas.

Ilichev said that the conception of security in Asia would also include the requirement that the nuclear-weapon states should discontinue any nuclear tests including those in the region of the Pacific Ocean and the Indian Ocean.

Ilichev pointed out that today the issues of peace and security are raised in Asia as keenly as in Europe. Over the recent period the aggressive policy of the United States has enhanced the danger of the Asian and Pacific region becoming another scene of military and political confrontation, Therefore we hold it imperative that all peace-loving forces in Asia should become more active and the Asian countries make united efforts to elaborate a more comprehensive interpretation of their security issues.

The opinion that the conditions for a comprehensive Asian political forum are not available can be heard sometimes, Ilyichev said. In our interpretation such a forum would be required in the last stage of the work serving the aim of Asia becoming a continent of lasting peace, friendship and genuine good-neighbourly relations, It is obvious that it could only be held after a certain period of time. It requires many years, strenuous work to establish an efficient system of security in Asia.

It is the most important thing today that genuine good-neighbourly relations be established between the Asian countries and their disputes be exclusively settled by peaceful means.

No genuine security can be created in Asia without the just, political settlement of conflicts in the different regions of the continent. It can only happen if the inalienable rights of all peoples to freedom, independence, and the independent choice of direction without external interference are recognized.

The issue of war and peace equally concerns the peoples of all countries in Asia. The issue of 'to be or not to be', the problem of the survival of humankind is a matter of particularly great concern. This is why the comprehensive programme of peace and disarmament included in Mikhail Gorbachev's January 15 statement was met favourably and with interest in the majority of Asian countries.

The leaders of Vietnam, Laos, Kampuchea, Mongolia and the DPR of Korea issued statements assuring the Soviet initiative of their full support.

The representative of the foreign minister of the People's Republic of China stated that the Soviet proposals contained some new features and they are being thoroughly studied by China. The official representatives of China, however, have as yet abstained from giving a genuine, public assessment of the Soviet proposals. The Chinese mass media carried only a brief summary of the statment.

It is noteworthy that the ASEAN countries have not made a formal reaction to the Soviet initiative. The opinion of the leaders of these states seems to depend on the position of Washington.

In Japan the Soviet proposals raised obvious interest and, on the whole, a favourable reaction. The different circles of the Japanese society received the statement of the CPSU CC general secretary with enthusiasm. The Soviet Union continues to strive for the maintenance and development of good-neighbourly relations with Japan, the Soviet deputy foreign minister said.

Over the recent period the Japanese leaders more frequently took a stand for the improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations. It is obvious that we have a positive answer, and thus Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU CC Political Committee [as recieved] and Soviet foreign minister paid a visit to Japan.

On the whole, the Soviet Union assessed the talks favourably. Political dialogue has been restored and will continue between our countries. I think it unnecessary to speak of the significance of Soviet-Japanese political dialogue. We are of the position that these two huge countries of Asia should find a common language. It is impossible, for instance, to hold different views on such issues of key importance like the elimination of nuclear danger.

It belongs to the positive achievements of the Tokyo visit of our foreign minister that both parties emphasized their intention to encourage commercial, economic, scientific, technical, cultural, and other kind of relations.

Of course there are some issues on which the Soviet Union and Japan hold different views. For instance, Japan does not condemn the U.S. "star wars" scheme. Whether it will only 'understand' the programme or take part in it is an important issue that determines our position towards Japan. A Japan participating in the 'Strategic Defence Initiative' differs from a Japan that stays away from the militarist programme.

The Soviet Union has always been the advocate of a Soviet-Japanese peace treaty. We are of the view that there can be an agreement in this field. As Eduard Shevardnadze said, we are ready to hold talks on a peace treaty. It does not mean that the Soviet Union, as it is sometimes said in Japan, would be ready to discuss the non-existing, so-called territorial issue.

The Soviet Union is open to any cooperation with Japan upon the basis of equality and reciprocal benefits. If Japan acts in a consistent and constructive way, we can look with confidence on the future of Soviet-Japanese relations.

On the Soviet-Chinese relations Ilichev said:

The mere fact that the representatives of the two countries launched talks and held consultations for three years is highly important. The consultation led to some results. The Soviet Union continues to show an initiating, constructive attitude both in political issues and in practical bilateral relations. The reciprocally acceptable agreements achieved through the joint efforts of the two sides considerably promoted the favourable changes in the Soviet-Chinese relations.

In the past two years the two countries signed agreements on trade and payments in the 1986-1990 period, economic, scientific and technical cooperation, and the establishment of a Soviet-Chinese committee for economic, commercial, scientific and technical cooperation. Bilateral trade is increasing, and scientific and technical relations have expanded.

In the consultations we have discussed the restoration of cultural exchange, and relations between the academies of sciences, ministries, national authorities and social organizations.

It is of principal importance from the aspect of the normalization of bilateral relations that Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU CC general secretary, met Li Peng, member of the CPC CC Political Committee and Chinese deputy prime minister, in May and December 1985, and that the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministers agreed in New York to pay official visits to one another's countries.

Despite the achievements, the level of political relations does not yet correspond to the opportunities arising from the socialist social order of the Soviet Union and China. This is why there is a lag in political relations which are still not based on a treaty. We hold it indispensable to create this basis.

Unfortunately, there is no genuine advance in political relations as China strives to add such issues to the scope of bilateral relations that are connected with third countries. We hold the position that we could agree on the normalization and improvement of our relations to China without preconditions, on the basis of the principles of equality and good-neighbourliness, without being against the interests of other countries.

On the Soviet-Indian relations Ilichev said:

The friendly relations of the two countries have been successfully developing for some decades. Political relations have become stable and trustful, and commercial, economic, scientific and technical relations have developed dynamically.

Personal relations on the top level are playing an important part in the accelerating development and strengthening of friendship and cooperation between our countries. As it is known, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi paid three visits to the Soviet Union, in March, May and October 1985. His meetings with Mikhail Gorbachev encouraged the cooperation of the Soviet Union and India in all fields.

Rajiv Gandhi invited Mikhail Gorbachev to India, who has accepted the invitation. The exact date of his visit will be made public later.

GDR ASSEMBLY DELEGATION TO FRG ISSUES COMMUNIQUE

LD220950 Moscow TASS in English 0903 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Bonn, February 22 TASS -- Ensuring peace is the most important task of our time. Everything must be done to end the arms race on Earth and prevent its spread to outer space, says a joint communique on the results of an official visit to the Federal Republic of Germany by a delegation from the People's Chamber of the German Democratic Republic, headed by the People's Chamber president, Horst Sindermann, at the invitation of Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the Bundestag faction of the Social Democratic Party of Germany.

Both sides, the communique says, regard the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva as an important step toward detente. They welcome the Soviet Union's peace initiatives which deserve a constructive reply from the West.

It was stressed during the talks between the two delegations that the chief conditions for peace in Europe are the inviolability of borders, respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European states.

PRESS CONFERENCE DISCUSSES U.S. 'NEOGLOBALISM'

LD212045 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1645 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Report on 21 February press conference held at the Congress Press Center in Moscow devoted to the Soviet peace program and regional conflicts granted by Nikolay Shishlin, head of a group of consultants for the Department for Liaison with Communist and Workers Parties of Socialists Countries; Vitaliy Kobysh, section head at the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee; Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry, Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the USSR Academy of sciences; Vitaliy Zhurkin, deputy director of the institute of the U.S. and Canada Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR; Alexsandr Bovin, political observer of IZVESTIYA; correspondent's unidentified -- passages within quotation marks recorded]

[Text] [Primakov] "In the United States greater and greater attention is being paid lately to topics related to so-called neoglobalism, to low intensity wars. This can be seen in a number of speeches by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. An analysis of Reagan's latest State of the Union message convinces one that this subject is also of increased interest to the U.S. President. What is happening is that it is being proclaimed essential for the United States to employ its entire arsenal, including the military, in order to prevent the development of situations in different regions of the world that are unfavorable to the United States, or to create situations that are favorable to the United States, also on the regional level. I refer to the situations in Nicaragua, Angola, Ethiopia, around Afghanistan, in Cambodia, and so on.

"Certain practical things have also recently been done in the context of so-called neoglobalism. First representatives of antigovernment forces are being received at the very highest level, for instance, Savimbi, the ringleader of the Angolan antigovernment gangs, and the anti-Sandinista contras. Increasing demands are made for meeting the requirements of the dushmans in Afghanistan, and so on. It is quite clear that the United State's complex, which could be described as a claim to the role of arbiter of the destinies of the world, is being revived at full throttle. But why is the concept of neoglobalism being pushed so insistently, and I would go so far as to say, so doggedly by the United States today? It seems that, first, this is a method by which the United States is attempting to wear down the USSR on a global scale; second, it is an attempt to halt the trend toward a change in public opinion after Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's 15 January statement that put forward a comprehensive plan for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons."

[Correspondent] The presidential election that took place recently in the Philippines are a vivid manifestation of the United States' policy of neoglobalism.

[Lomeyko] "Those who are present here obviously know that according to the information that has been officially published Marcos won the election by obtaining 1.5 million more votes than the opposition candidate, Aquino. These results have been confirmed by the National Assembly. I would like to stress as a point of principle that only the Filipinos themselves, and they alone, are able to decide their country's fate, including the question of to whom the supreme post in their state should be entrusted. Naturally we cannot fail to pay attention to the fact that many Philippine political figures and the public resolutely reject any interference in the internal affairs of their country, especially attempts to impose institutions and values from the other side of the ocean.

And there are more than sufficient grounds for indignation of this kind: For how else can one describe the fact that literally crowds of emissaries from across the ocean were sent to this country on the very eve of the election, to observe the election, to follow their progress, to conciliate between the hostile factions and so on and so forth. Many questions can be asked: Why was it necessary to send the Blue Ridge, the flagship of the U.S. 7th Fleet, and the aircraft carrier Midway to the shores of the Philippines on the very eve of the election? Why was it necessary to send an additional 2,000 Marines from the Rapid Deployment Force and 200 Green Berets instructors in the suppression of disturbances, so to speak? Was this not direct interference in the affairs of another sovereign state?"

[Correspondent] The journalists who asked questions at the press conference noted that in a number of regions of the world the international situation, following the Geneva meeting, has not only failed to improve but has even become more complicated. Who, then, is to blame for this?

[Kobysh] "The picture, so to speak, is this: Soviet-U.S. talks are apparently taking place; there would even appear to be some progress, particularly as far as Euromissiles are concerned; a new summit meeting is possible -- in short there is some movement forward. But under cover of all this the United States is rigidly implementing, more rigidly than it was before, its course in the regions, in the hot spots of the world, as we journalists call them. It is doing so openly, aggressively, and imperialistically. This is the impression that we are getting. And of course this cannot fail to put one on one's guard."

[Correspondent] And how can President Reagan's visit to Grenada be described? Is this not a manifestation of the policy of neoglobalism?

[Kobysh] "This is classic imperialism. It has found its most colorful expression, so to speak, in this affair. They didn't just crucify and crush the country: The country is in a complete state of disorder. You know the objective data; you have the information. Virtually half of the population there is out of work, everything has been destroyed. And they are now unveiling a monument there to the soldiers who died during the liberation of Grenada. Liberation from what? Liberation from the desire of people to live in a way that benefits human beings. And Reagan has gone there to put his blessing upon this process, as it were, a process that the United States does not now conceal and which they call neoglobalism in Washington."

[Correspondent] Complications in a number of regions of our planet, or regional conflicts, as they say, are giving rise to alarm everywhere. But at the same time those complications are no doubt not the main problem that disturbs peace-loving mankind, particularly today.

[Bovin] "As far as I understand it, the main problem now lies not in what is taking place in, say, Nicaragua and the Republic of South Africa, although of itself this is very important, but the main thing amounts to this: Will we or will we not manage to survive? This is the main problem, and to solve this main problem we have to deal first and foremost with issues of disarmament, because if there is no disarmament then none of the remaining regional conflicts will be of great importance. We consider, therefore, that it is possible to single out some priorities in policy -- something is more important, something is less so -- and in our view the problem with the main priority, I repeat, is the problem of universal disarmament, despite the fact that of course we understand the importance of solutions of regional conflicts."

[Correspondent] Those present also answered other questions from the journalists.

U.S. PLANS 'ARMED OPERATIONS' AROUND WORLD

LD240905 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2005 GMT 23 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" Program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] Those on the other side of the ocean are still raging over international terrorists. This concern is being voiced in speeches by U.S. politicians on television and in the press. Shadows of the past are being recalled from oblivion -- retired generals and former CIA agents -- in order to theoretically substantiate the philosophy of active interference by the United States in various regions of the world under the banner of the struggle against terrorism. This philosophy of the prehistoric age has even been given an official name: "military action of low intensity." From now on, what is involved is not just individual armed operations by the Pentagon of the Grenada sort for strengthening U.S. positions that were shattered in this or that minor or developing country, but a global policy of state terrorism by the United States.

It has already been reported that a conference called "military action of low intensity" was recently held in Washington under the patronage of Caspar Weinberger. This was not a scientific conference, but concrete instructions were issued concerning specific actions of a military or nonmilitary nature that could be taken by the United States in order to substantiate the imperial doctrine of new globalism. The U.S. ruling circles claim the right to directly manage affairs throughout the globe. The U.S. doctrine, as Buchanan, one of the leading presidential advisers declared, proclaims that the United States should not tolerate the fact that as soon as any country joins the socialist or communist camp it is to stay there forever. In Buchanan's words, the United States reserves the right for herself to render assistance to freedom fighters. By the so-called advocates of freedom Washington means that Afghan bandits, whose hands are stained with the blood of thousands of peaceful inhabitants; the Somozite gangs, who make criminal sallies against the Republic of Nicaragua; the terrorists from the dissident Angola grouping of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola; and the Pol Pot bandits, who are trying to hinder the building of a new life in Cambodia.

But the United States does not rely exclusively on those mercenaries. The Pentagon is developing strategy and tactics for the U.S. Armed Forces in the so-called wars of low intensity. A special role is being assigned to the special purpose troops. The Green Berets, Rangers, sabotage units, "Delta" and others receive modern armaments and combat equipment. During the current year, the Pentagon will spend over $1 billion for expanding and fitting the units of professional killers. At U.S. training grounds and bases, cutthroats dressed in camouflage uniforms train operators on seizing individual facilities and whole cities, sabotage, and how to kipnap state and political figures who do not suit Washington. The interventionist doctrine of new globalism is directed against Afghanistan and Nicaragua, Angola and Cambodia, Ethiopia and Libya -- against all countries that conduct an independent, anti-imperialist policy. Under the banner of struggle against terrorism, Washington is planning large-scale armed operations in various areas of the world, and the Pentagon and CIA are assigned leading roles in these minor wars.

Recently the U.S. magazine ROLLING STONE published the confessions of Miles Copeland, a former CIA agent. This ominous name is well-known in the Middle-East. After World War II, Copeland headed the U.S. spy center in Damascus; then he was transferred to Cairo where following the orders of his bosses at Langley, he was preparing the unsuccessful attempt to assassinate Jamal 'Abd al-Nasir.

Nobody knows better than me, the retired U.S. agent bragged, how a government is being replaced, no matter whether it is done by force or by other means.

Now Miles Copeland is advising on better ways of accomplishing U.S. subversive operations in developing counties. But even he has to admit that this policy does not have a future. At present, Copeland declared, most of the world is set against us; that is, against the United States. When we go out sailing on our gunboats, when we bomb villages and kill women and children, in much greater numbers than the terrorists, we antagonize the whole world.

The same fate awaits the new aggressive doctrines of today's knights of cloak and dagger on the other side of the ocean.

REPORT, COMMENT ON REAGAN'S GRENADA TRIP

New Threats Issued

LD212042 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 21 Feb 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Speaking at St Georges during his visit to Grenada, President Reagan grossly attacked Cuba and Nicaragua, making new threats against them. The parallel that he drew between the events in Grenada preceding the U.S. aggression and the present situation in Nicaragua has led observers to the conclusion that that invasion to all intents and purposes was the beginning of the implementation of the policy of neoglobalism, and could be repeated.

Spontaneous demonstrations have taken place in Grenada during the U.S. President's visit. Punitive squads dealt harshly with the demonstrators, and dozens of demonstrators were thrown into jail.

U.S. 'Betrayal, Perfidy' Decried

LD220311 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2025 GMT 21 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Excerpt] Speaking of friendship and solidarity, I will proceed now to an event that reminded us of betrayal and perfidy. I mean the visit by President Reagan to Grenada, which took place yesterday.

Deigning to visit this tiny island in the Caribbean, Reagan wanted to do it for three reasons: First, to commemorate U.S. soldiers who died in October, 1983, during the bandit landing and capture of the island. Here is is, laying a wreath to the monument to U.S. soldiers. [video shows Reagan arriving, laying wreath] Second, the President has inaugurated an international airport in Point Salines; and the third reason for his visit is apparently the most important one: Reagan staged some sort of demonstration of Caribbean solidarity with Washington. He has attempted to rally his marionettes, heading unreservedly submissive regimes in several small Caribbean states, even closer around him. These obedient servants of Washington were assembled in St. Georges a day before Reagan arrived there by his emissary for the dirtiest affairs, General Vernon Walters, former CIA deputy director, who is now U.S. permanent representative at the United Nations. The marionettes obeyed the general in the way recruits obey their warrant officer.

If I wanted just to comment on this event, I would confine myself to just this explanation of the reasons for the visit, perhaps complem nting it by recalling the changes that Grenada underwent over the 2 years and 4 months of U.S. occupation: complete degradation of the national economy, sharp decline in the people's welfare, failure of social programs, growth of unemployment, which is up to 40 percent, and so on and so forth.

All this is true, but I would like to leave the confines of such standard and impartial analysis. That is, in this case, what is involved is far from being just a traditional, customary visit by the head of one state to the head of another. No, let us call a spade a spade. The main organizer and commander in chief of the bandit terrorist operation came to review the fruits of his labor, so to speak, to feast his eyes upon the outcome of feats by his subordinates, to sum up the results complacently. From his point of view, the results are undoubtedly positive. Well, little Grenada is not Vietnam; it was not that difficult to occupy the tiny island from a military point of view. The 19 U.S. soldiers who met their death there are, after all, a trifling cost -- from the point of view of the U.S. Administration -- for the glorious victory, even more so if one bears in mind the fact that over 50,000 Americans died pointless and futile deaths in Vietnam. Now, the master of the White House, bringing the fashionable Washington doctrine of neoglobalism to life and reaffirming the absolute domination of the Stars and Stripes there in a way, proudly sets his foot on the soil of the enslaved Grenada. Well, what comes next? One would like to ask this of those who set the President's hasty expedition underway, those who wrote his speeches about Grenada and for Grenade, those who obligingly pulled the red carpet toward the President's plane. In order to understand what happens next, one should look back, one should recall some chapters in history.

'Strange Logic' Noted

LD230948 Moscow TASS in English 0913 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 23 TASS -- TASS correspondent V. Legantsov reporting.

The regular weekend radio address of U.S. President Ronald Reagan essentially boiled down to an effort to justify U.S. armed aggression against Grenada and scare sovereign Nicaragua.

Without as much as a shade of embarrassment the White House incumbent described an act of state terrorism -- the seizure of the tiny insular state of Grenada on which the Pentagon brought down the might of its intervention forces -- as the liberation "of the people of Grenada from the grip of tyranny." Following what may be mildly termed strange logic, the President tried to pass off the occupation of Grenada by U.S. troops and the installation there of a regime that suits Washington as the "restoration of order and freedom to Grenada."

The President alleged that the remains of the Somocista bands that commit atrocious crimes on Nicaragua's soil are "freedom fighters now struggling against the communist dictatorship." In the President's words, U.S. aid to the bands of killers and thugs is "both morally right and vital to our national security." Revolutionary Nicaragua has long evoked special hatred in Washington. The ruling quarters of the United States cannot forgive the Nicaraguans for having taken the destiny of the country into their own hands and starting to build a new life. Even now the revolution provides free medical assistance and education to the people. Washington would very much like to deprive the Nicaraguans of the gains serving as an example for other Central American nations, and restore the former colonial order in the country.

Commenting on the presidential radio address to the nation, the ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency links it with the intention of the President to send an official request to the U.S. Congress for additional funds to help the anti-Nicaraguan bands. According to an AP report, the President is going to ask for 100 million dollars for that purpose.

U.S. JUDGMENT OF NICARAGUAN REVOLUTION CRITICIZED

LD220021 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 21 Feb 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] You may possibly have already read in this morning press about President Reagan's meetings over the last few days with congressional leaders. I would like to dwell in a little more detail on his meeting, on his conversation with Republican leaders in Congress. After this meeting, which took place this week, White House Deputy Press Secretary Larry Speakes explained to journalists that the President discussed with congressmen ways and means of further expanding U.S. military aid for the Nicaraguan contras. As Speakes told it, the President and members of his Cabinet depicted the desperate situation of the fighters for freedom in dramatic hues to the congressmen, and tried to substantiate in every possible way the need to allocate them -- these freedom fighters, that is, these bandits and killers fighting the Nicaraguan people -- fresh multimillion dollar assistance. Reagan is asking for $100 million from Congress this year. One journalist -- and this where an interesting episode occurred -- asked: Did Larry Speakes -- and, naturally, the administration that he represents -- did they not consider that the Sandinists have the right to defend themselves and their country against the contras? Larry Speakes maneuvered, evaded a direct reply to this question, and said the following: We deplore the fact that the Nicaraguan Government is not observing the principles of its revolution.

The journalists, of course, were amazed: Larry Speakes in the role of revolutionary theoretician! But Larry Speakes continued and went on to develop his idea: We consider, he said, the Nicaraguan revolution to be a hijacked revolution, its principles are not being observed; we, that is, the Washington administration, we want, said Larry Speakes, the Sandinist Government to observe these principles, the principles of the Nicaraguan revolution.

Well, comrades, as the saying goes, that's the limit! Official Washington, as we can see, has invested itself with the authority to decide and to express its judgments on what the paths of the revolution should be in Nicaragua. Washington considers it has a right to evaluate the character of this revolution, its aims, the means of achieving these aims. I think that it is simply impossible to take such arguments seriously. Let us try, in this connection, to remember what...[changes thought] After all, let's say, the United States also, as an independent state, in its time saw the light of day as a result of a revolution. And so, let's try to imagine how they would have reacted in Washington if someone outside that country, today started talking about the fact that the behests of that revolution, the American one, have been betrayed, that the United States are not on the course that they should be following, that the principles of the revolution for which the great American founding fathers fought are not being observed, and that in general that whole American revolution has been hijacked and betrayed. Well, honestly speaking, one could, in my opinion, find a grain of reason in these reproaches. But let us imagine that someone outside the United States, trying to reshape the development of American democracy to their manner and style and to return the United States to the sources of that revolution, proposed to begin deliveries of weapons and ammunition to some opposition forces coming out against the current administration in today's America.

It is unlikely that discourse on this theme, and moreover, such actions, would be welcomed by official circles in the United States.

Well, really, the Americans themselves should judge what system today's America needs. Ultimately, it is the American people who should resolve the issue of whether the current administration, let's say, is observing the behests of Lincoln or Washington, and not the Russian people or the Japanese or the French. Then why not grant precisely the same right to decide their internal problems and determine their path, let's say, to the Nicaraguans or the Angolans? Why does Washington deprive them of this right and consider that precisely it, Washington, must judge whether the Nicaraguan revolution has strayed off course or not? This is precisely how, after all, the U.S. Administration is acting now in relation to Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Angola, when it gives military aid to the Somozite contras or the Afghan dushmans, when with pomp it receives Savimbi, head of the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola bands.

All this is nothing other than the finished expression of the policy of so-called new globalism, neo-globalism, which this past week has been literally elevated by Washington to the rank of official foreign policy doctrine.

ANGOLA NEXT TARGET OF U.S. 'NEOGLOBALISM'

LD240349 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] U.S. President Reagan embarked on yet another bellicose campaign this week. He demanded that Congressional leaders allocate military aid to the Nicaraguan contras and to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola [UNITA] terrorists in Angola. Trying to convince the legislators, the White House chief argued that freedom fighters cannot fight helicopters aided only by mosquito nets. What a strange notion for the U.S. President to have. He sees bandits as the defenders of democracy, while for him the bazookas and mortars with which these rogues are armed have turned into protection against insects.

The White House is steering the situation toward strengthening its military interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign countries whose policy does not suit the United States. That is the reaction of U.S. ruling circles to progressive changes taking place in the world. That is Washington's recipe for resolving regional problems. The United States has even backed up this aggressive course with a theoretical concept, giving it the pompous title of neoglobalism. The cutting edge of this doctrine is directed against peoples that have decided to free themselves from the capitalist yoke. Its embodiment in practice is to be seen, for example, in the seizure of Grenada. The U.S. Administration considers violence against the people of this tiny island to be a great victory. Evidence of that is provided by President Reagan's visit to Grenada, where he solmenly laid a wreath at the monument to several U.S. commandos who died infamously on Grenadan soil.

Under the banner of neoglobalism, the United States is waging an undeclared war against Nicaragua and Afghanistan and now Angola's turn has come. To be fair, it should be noted that the CIA has already been carrying out secret operations against the Angolan people for a long time. Until recently, however, the United States has been restrained by the so-called Clark Amendment, which forbids the provision of aid to UNITA gangs. The Reagan Administration has managed to abolish this law and this enables Washington to begin giving military support to Savimbi on a large scale.

It is true that this plan is giving rise to protests even in the U.S. Congress. To be sure, Angola maintains mutually advantageous business contacts with several major U.S. companies. There is another rather unpleasant aspect for the White House. Savimbi is well known as a long-standing agent of the racist regime in the Republic of South Africa. In giving support to UNITA terrorists, the U.S. Administration is acting at one with the apartheid state and all the more so since the UNITA men can only receive the military aid through the territory of South Africa and Namibia.

In helping UNITA, the United States is not only violating the sovereignty of People's Angola, but is also acting openly as the ally of the racists.

Weapons 'Already Delivered'

LD222146 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1630 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] The United States has already delivered the first consignment of weapons to the terrorist UNITA group. The weapons include antitank and antiaircraft missiles. For more than a decade the UNITA group has been waging an armed struggle against the legitimate Government of Angola. Until recently, the bandits largely relied on South Africa. However, this month the UNITA ringleader, Savimbi, visited Washington. He was received by President Reagan. The United States promised all-round assistance for the UNITA group.

Commentary Examines U.S. Aid

LD222143 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1630 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpt] The United States is preparing to shortly undertake another ominous step towards boosting subversion against Angola. This time it plans to generously supply with weaponry the anti-Angolan organization UNITA that is carrying out subversive operations against economic enterprises and peaceful citizens of Angola. The ringleader of UNITA, Jonas Savimbi, boasted at a press conference following his visit to the United States that Washington had given him reliable guarantees of American military aid to UNITA. Moreover, Savimbi publicly listed the items of the death arsenal to be shortly supplied by the Pentagon. These include among other things antitank and antiaircraft systems. To purchase this weaponry, the terrorists will receive 54 million dollars from their American patrons.

Clearly, Savimbi's overseas voyage wasn't confined to staging a public show, with the purpose of making the UNITA terrorists look politically more respectable. The new African (?ideal) of American conservatives, as Savimbi was baptized by newsmen, was not only treated kindly in Washington but also is receiving weapons to further scale up the undeclared war imperialism and racism are waging on sovereign Angola. Savimbi's visit to Washington and the events that have followed clearly indicate who is the true inspirer and patron of this war. It would be quite misleading to assume that UNITA is capable of seriously threatening Angola and its Armed Forces. As is known, last September a shattering defeat was inflicted on the UNITA ganga and only the interference of the South African troops saved it from complete destruction. Even Western mass media had to admit this.

It is also crystal clear that Washington and Pretoria use the UNITA banner as a cover for carrying through their own subversive policies for Angola and to overthrow the legitimate government in Luanda and strangle the popular revolution in Angola they hate so much.

The planned supplies of American weaponry to the bandits pursue the same goal. For the same purpose, the neocolonialist circles of the United States, together with the Pretoria racists, are planning to transfer up to 30,000 mercenaries to Angola. They calculate that under the UNITA banner this invasion force will better succeed in smashing the progressive regime in the People's Republic of Angola.

This is an example of open and impudent manifestation of the United States policy of international terrorism. In this way the United States actions were qualified by the majority of members of the United Nations Security Council at its recent session. The participants resolutely condemned the scaling up of the American aid to the terrorists as well as Washington's so-called constructive engagement with Pretoria, spearheaded against independent African countries whose policies annoy imperialists and racists. The African public voices just indignation about the policy of the Reagan administration.

U.S. PLANNING MILITARY AID TO CHADIAN GOVERNMENT

PM240916 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Supplying Arms"]

[Text] Washington, 22 Feb -- A State Department spokesman announced that in the course of the next few days the United States will supply the Habre regime with large shipments of arms and ammunition as emergency aid. At present, he pointed out, Washington is expecting an inquiry from the Chadian capital regarding the nature of future deliveries. The United States has already allocated 6 million dollars for military aid to Chad in the current fiscal year.

Tension Serves U.S. Interests

LD230354 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1759 GMT 22 Feb 86

["Chad: What Underlies the Invasion" -- TASS item identifier]

[Text] Moscow, 22 Feb (TASS) -- TASS political observer Sergey Kulik writes:

In analyzing the causes which forced Paris, for the second time in the past 3 years, to decide on armed intervention in Chad, many observers have come together in the view that France has sent troops to this country by no means only to remind of her role as gendarme in the service of imperialist interests in Western Africa. At a time when the United States continues to escalate military provocations off the northern shores of Libya, creating an additional source of tension in the southern "underbelly" of the Jamahiriyah clearly corresponds to the interests of the White House.

This is particularly obvious if it is taken into account that the frenzied anti-Libyan campaign that Washington is conducting has not met with the expected support in Africa, and the knowingly false motives with which the White House is endeavoring to justify it have not been accepted there. The African countries refuse to see "the world center of international terrorism" in Tripoli insofar as, according to their conviction, it is situated in Washington.

To the accompaniment of Reagan's speeches, which abound in abusive [branny] epithets directed at the Libyan leaders, Jamahiriya delegations visited a number of African countries. There the countries not only did not react to the United States call for an economic boycott of Libya, but even went on, prepared to expand cooperation with her.

Washington simultaneously got two slaps in the face from the African giants Nigeria and the Sudan for its extortionate credit policy, and clashed with the growth of anti-American feelings in these key countries of the continent. The signs of democratization in Khartoum, and the steps it has taken to normalize relations with Tripoli and Addis Ababa have given rise, as the Egyptian newspaper AL-AHALI writes, in the Reagan administration to "nightmares of the prospect of the creation of a unified belt of friendly and hardly pro-U.S. states along a line of Libya-Sudan-Ethiopia." In Lagos, in the words of the NIGERIAN VOICE, Washington "is being put into a rage" by the resolve of the current government of this country "to settle accounts with those who would like to recolonize Nigeria."

Now take a map of Africa and try to look at it through the eyes of Washington geopoliticians. Surely Chad -- situated in the very center of the North African subcontinent and bordering on Libya, as well as Sudan and Nigeria -- is, from the point of view of the White House, that "ideal place" from where it is possible to apply pressure on Tripoli, Khartoum, and Lagos simultaneously and at the same time muddy the water in the whole of this huge region.

Already the experience of the first intervention undertaken in 1983 under the code name "Manta" suggested to the U.S. Administration that it was not Paris that stood to make the maximum gain from this venture but Washington, having occupied strategic positions in the zone considered in the West the "reserve" [zapovednik] of French interests. Thus the Pentagon got the opportunity to create a military base in the south of Chad. In N'Djamena and a number of other towns, several hundreds of thousands of U.S. military specialists have appeared who are not only training the army of the pro-Western Habre regime in punitive operations against the fighters of the Transitional Government for National Unity, but are participating directly in military actions. From year to year the supplies of U.S. weapons, including tanks and missiles, used by N'Djamena in the struggle against patriotic forces, grow.

The methods by which Habre suppresses the opposition do not fit in at all with ideas about human rights. But "in spite of Habre's unsavory reputation, NEWSWEEK admits, sources close to the Reagan administration have confirmed that the CIA is helping him." The U.S. journalist J. Campbell, who has access to secret documents of the House of Representatives Intelligence Committee of the U.S. Congress, characterizes Habre quite simply as a "CIA man," who is in power thanks to $10 million in support from Langley.

In this context, the current intervention of the "hawks" is nothing more than a collective neocolonialist action by Paris and Washington, which has been undertaken in order to prolong the power in N'Djamena of the "CIA man", who is hated by the Chadian people. Talk to the effect that French soldiers have appeared in the heart of Africa in order to "prevent Libya from occupying Chad" or to "prevent Tripoli from creating its own empire on the dark continent" looks simply like attempts to use clumsy propaganda to justify yet another case of "neoglobalism."

U.S. MILITARY PRESENCE IN INDIAN OCEAN DECRIED

OW211243 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 20 Feb 86

[Alekseyev commentary from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The current week has been announced by the WPC as the week of Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf countries.

[Alekseyev] Hello comrades. This vast region of the globe inhabited by over one-third of the world's people has become, during the last decade, the object of intensive military activity by imperialistic powers led by the United States. Large military bases have been created on Diego Garcia Island, in Oman, Somalia, and Kenya, and some other states. Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf waters are crossed by armadas of U.S. warships carrying nuclear weapons. The region is patrolled by B-52 strategic bombers, and reconnaissance aircraft equipped with AWACS. The unprecedented increase in the U.S. military presence in the region alone is contrary to the official Washington version about the defense of Persian Gulf states from the alleged threat of the Iran-Iraq war. U.S. Administration officials themselves have conceded that a military victory is not possible for either side in the Iran-Iraq conflict, and that such an outcome would be strategically undesirable for the United States. This was stated by Assistant Secretary of State Murphy. Secret Pentagon documents designating the Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf region as a special strategic zone in U.S. global policy and ordering the U.S. Armed Forces to be prepared at their own initiative and without waiting for invitation by friendly governments, to take up positions in the region, or in other words, to commit aggression, have been leaked to the press.

It is in this manner that Washington is implementing its neoglobalistic policy that turns peoples of the region into hostages of its military strategic plans.

Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf states and all the peace-loving forces on the planet justly demand that U.S. military presence and bases be eliminated in order to create a zone of genuine peace and cooperation in this region of the planet.

TASS NOTES POLITICIZING OF SHUTTLE MISHAP

LD231728 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 23 TASS -- By TASS correspondent I. Ignatyev:

The investigation into the disaster of the space shuttle Challenger is turning ever more political. The search for the causes of the blast that destroyed the Challenger, notes the ASSOCIATED PRESS, has raised new questions related both to spacecraft equipment and decision-making by the leadership of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

It has become known that 15 engineers of Morton Thiokol, which manufactures solid-fuel boosters, strongly objected to the January 28 launch after learning about sharp drops in air temperature at the launch site. The corporation's Vice President Joe Kilminster and the NASA leadership ignored their objections, however.

In the light of the new information, Senator Albert Gore has demanded the resignation of acting NASA Administrator William Graham. He observed that the agency's leadership agreed to the lift-off despite apparant warnings about a poesible danger.

The Challenger tragedy compels ever more people in the United States to ponder over dangerous consequences of the White House's "stars wars" programme. The loss of the space shuttle gave a lesson that, however sophisticated and advanced technology might be, one should not rule out man's role, member of the House of Representatives Dan Glickman stressed in Congress. An analogy with the Strategic Defence Initiative is striking, he went on. It is insanity to reply fully on lasers and advanced computers in the defence of the United States.

The Challenger mishap, noted THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper, is a reminder of how unreliable such systems are: Even a small element in a long-planned launch may break down and bring about a disaster.

Nashville (Tennessee), February 23 TASS -- By TASS correspondent A. Shalnev:

Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter has demanded that the administration of Ronald Reagan renounce the "star wars" plans. This should be done as soon as possible, he said at a seminar on East-West relations at Vanderbilt University.

Carter described SDI as a tragic mistake, a deluding concept. Not a single responsible scientist believes, he said, that it is possible to create an inpenetrable anti-missile defence. The implementation of SDI would result in the transfer of the nuclear arms race into outer space and become a hard-to-overcome obstacle in the way of arms control accords.

The former American president stressed that the latest Soviet initiatives, advanced by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, represent a basis for constructive negotiations. These are sensible, much-promising proposals, Carter said.

Carter came out in favour of the termination of nuclear explosions by the United States which, he recalled, the Soviet Union already did unilaterally. He stressed the importance of banning the tests of anti-satellite weapons.

PENTAGON OUT TO GAIN CONTROL OF SHUTTLE PROGRAM

LD211835 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports:

Vice-Admiral Richard Truly has been appointed NASA deputy director in charge of space flights. He will now head the space shuttle program. A statement to this effect was made at a press conference here.

Way back in 1965, Richard Truly was included into the group of military astronauts, who created the U.S. Air Force orbital laboratory. He took part in a program of testing a prototype of a space shuttle, and then made two flights on board the space shuttle. From October 1983 Richard Truly headed the space command of the U.S. Navy, which runs reconnaissance and navigation satellites as well as relaying satellites ensuring communication with U.S. naval ships world-wide.

The appointment of a high-ranking military as head of the space shuttle program is evidence that the Pentagon is out to take the space shuttle program completely under its control. Already now the Defence Department broadly uses space ships with its aims, and for the coming years it has "reserved" for itself practically every third space shuttle mission.

ILICHEV TALKS WITH PRC AMBASSADOR IN MOSCOW

PM211802 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 20 February L.F. Ilichev, USSR deputy foreign minister, received Li Zeqang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, and had a conversation with him on certain topical international problems, primarily questions connected with the 15 January statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

EMBASSY IN BEIJING MARKS SOVIET ARMED FORCES DAY

Xu Xin Attends Reception

OW231609 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 0400 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] The Soviet Embassy in China held a reception marking the 68th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Armed Forces. Xu Xin, deputy chief of the General Staff of Chinese People's Liberation Army, attended the reception.

Soviet-War Dead Honored

OW231629 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1100 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] On the occasion of Soviet Armed Forces Day, the staff members of the Soviet Embassy in the People's Republic of China laid wreaths at fallen Soviet soldiers' monuments in Harbin, Shenyang, Changchun, Dalian, Mudanjiang, Jiamusi, and Wuhan. The Soviet soldiers heroically gave their lives in order to liberate China during the war against Japanese aggressors.

PRC TO TRY HIJACKERS OF SOVIET PLANE

LD211547 Moscow TASS in English 1517 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Beijing, February 21 TASS -- The XINHUA news agency reports that a spokesman of the press department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China (PRC) stated today that, in accordance with the laws of the PRC and the international convention, criminal proceedings will be instituted against the hijacker of the Soviet passenger plane.

The spokesman recalled that on December 19, 1985, the hijacked passenger plane of the civil aviation of the USSR had landed in the territory of China. Shortly after that the Chinese Government, with a view to ensuring the safety of the plane and the passengers took necessary measures and rendered due assistance, ensuring the speediest and safe return of 42 Soviet passengers who had been on board the plane, the crew members, and the hijacked plane itself to the Soviet Union.

The Chinese Government holds that the criminal actions of the hijacker of the plane are a breach not only of the relevant international convention but of Chinese laws as well.

RENMIN RIBAO CITED ON 1946 EVENTS IN PRC

PM211634 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Article in Chinese Newspaper"]

[Text] Beijing, 20 Feb -- The newspaper RENMIN RIBAO has published an article devoted to the history of the Chinese people's struggle to liberate northeast China after the Soviet Army had routed Japanese militarism and Soviet troops had withdrawn from the region in March 1946.

The article notes that June 1946 saw the reorganization of the leadership of CPC party organs and military formations in northeast China. Lin Biao was appointed secretary of the CPC Northeast Bureau and commander and political commissar of the United Democratic Army, with Peng Zhen, Luo Rongtan, Gao Gang, and Chen Yun as deputy secretaries and political commissars.

In July 1946 an enlarged session of the CPC Northeast Bureau was held in Harbin that adopted a resolution on the situation and tasks. The resolution stressed the paramount importance of the work to create a party stronghold in this part of China.

"After the victory over Japan in the resistance war the CPC's victory in the struggle for the northeast ensured a reliable base for the country's final liberation and created favorable conditions for restoring and developing the national economy after the creation of the new China," RENMIN RIBAO writes.

COMMENTARIES NOTE U.S. THREAT TO ASIA, PRC

New Weapons Given to Taiwan

OW240428 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Volskiy commentary: "Imperialism's Global Strategy of Aggression"]

[Excerpts] The world is in a complicated and changing situation. On the one hand, we see the results of the USSR-U.S. Geneva summit. Comrade Gorbachev has put forward a grand plan for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of this century. The movement to prevent a new war is developing in various places of the world. All this has created important conditions for turning international relations to a constructive course. However, on the other hand, the more the constructive trend developes, the stronger the imperialist aggressive group resists.

The United States is doing its best to expand the arms race, including into space. At the same time, it is aggravating tension throughout the world and looking for more strategic bases. While opposing the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, imperialism also wants to strictly control developing countries. These objectives of U.S. imperialism's global strategy can also be seen in East Asia. The Pentagon has almost formally called East Asia a second possible theater of war in the next world war with a significance only second to Europe. The U.S. imperialist aggressive group is preparing for another world war.

Now let us look at the map. In South Korea, there are 40,000 U.S. troops and nuclear weapons are stored there. The various islands of Japan, primarily Okinawa and Guam, which was declared a U.S. colony, have become important U.S. strategic bases.

On Micronesia, which was illegally annexed by the United States, a number of strategic bases are being built, including bases for the Pentagon's "star wars" plan. The United States has had large air and naval bases in the Philippines for several decades and has stored nuclear weapons there. Lastly, the United States has set up its bastion on Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. In other words, all of the East and Southeast Asia are bound by the United States.

Implerialism's bases for its global strategy are being linked one after another, including Taiwan, which belongs to China but was illegally separated. The United States has stubbornly obstructed Taiwan's reunification with China. This is not only because of its favorable impression of Taiwan's pro-imperialism regime, but also because of the fact that the island can be used as a military outpost. It is more important to note that large quantities of new types of weapons are being shipped there by the United States. This is by no means coincidental.

In fact, the positions of imperialism's global strategy in East Asia are located so that they can threaten China and put military and political pressure on this large country in East Asia and finally forcing it to be subordinated to imperialist forces.

U.S. Policy 'Hostile' to PRC

OW231944 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0700 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Losev commentary]

[Excerpts] Our actual life constantly proves the correctness of Marxist-Leninist doctrines on the nature of class structure in human society. A struggle now exists between socialist and imperialist countries.

Imperialism, capitalism, and all other exploitive societies are founded on a system of private ownership of the means of production. The system of private ownership enables some people to live by relying on others, and enables some countries to become rich by exploiting other countries. This is why all imperialists bitterly hate the socialist world, because the presence of a socialist world proves that people can live without the system of private ownership. In other words, they can live in a situation in which there is no landlord nor capitalist. This is why imperialist countries have a profound class hatred for the socialist world.

It is not accidential either that at present, U.S. imperialism has, through the Reagan administration, declared the so-called crusade against all socialist countries and forces. It is a general offensive against soicalism, as an ideology and as a social system. The main target of the offensive is the Soviet Union because our country was the first to take socialist road.

We would like to point out that imperialism, including U.S. imperialism, is also hostile to the People's Republic of China. This fact is shown by the so-called hope openly expressed by Washington that the foundation of socialism in China will be turn down. This is also shown by the continued active support given to the reactionary Kuomintang regime in Taiwan by U.S. imperialism. U.S. support of Taiwan is a wanton interference in China's internal affairs. The strengthening of U.S. military bases near eastern and southern borders of China also shows U.S. hostility against China.

TRUD EXAMINES PRC URBAN HOUSING PROBLEMS

PM211010 Moscow TRUD in Russian 20 Feb 86 p 3

[Ye. Piskunov article: "What the Ancient Architects Overlooked. Problems of China's Big Cities"]

[Text] "Straight on, turn right, and then turn left" -- you will definitely hear these words in any city in the world in response to a request for directions to the house or apartment you may be looking for. In any city, that is, apart from Beijing. The PRC capital is laid out strictly according to the cardinal points: Streets run in parallel from north to south or from west to east, and intersect at right angles. "Go south, then turn west, north, or east" -- this is what a citizen of Beijing will tell you, depending on your destination.

The square layout of the ancient city -- Beijing is over 3,000 years old -- was determined by the medieval builders' design to turn China's capital into an integrated architectural whole. Its center was the rectangular palace complex named the Purple Forbidden City. The emperors lived there and, as the name makes clear, ordinary people were strictly prohibited from entering. Around it was the Imperial City, encircled by a 9 km long perimeter wall. There were four city gates situated symmetrically on its four sides. Beyond the Imperial City lies the square Inner City. To the south is the rectangular Outer City. From the top of Coal Hill -- an artificial knoll by the northern gate of the Forbidden City -- you get a panoramic view of the whole of Beijing: the golden roofs of buildings and pagodas in a sea of greenery, the rectangular houses with inner courtyards, and the decorative arched gates breaking the monotony of the long main streets.

But the ancient architects, in their attempt to contain the city within the ring of its fortified wall, overlooked the main point -- Beijing was bound to and did develop. And the housing problem has become one of its most acute problems.

Following the formation of the PRC, active work was started during the years of the First 5-Year Plan to widen and connect the streets stretching around the Forbidden City. The eastern, western, and northern walls of the Imperial, Inner, and Outer Cities were demolished and large gates were removed from Tiananmen Square and the Xisi, Dignsi, and Donganmen Districts. Modern structures were erected to replace the single-story buildings.

But the pace of housing construction slowed down sharply during the so-called "Cultural Revolution." The city's population density increased to 120,000 per square km. Even today the bulk of the Chinese capitals' housing stock consists of single-story homes without main sewerage and water supply, divided by the narrow lanes known as hutong. Time and periodically recurring earthquakes -- the last one was in 1976 -- render them unfit for occupation. According to the Chinese newspaper CHINA DAILY, housing in 29 of Beijing's districts is in a dangerous condition: Walls are cracked and roofs leak.

Over 200,000 families are now waiting to be housed in Beijing, Ke Huanzhan, director of the Beijing Municipal People's Government Urban Planning and Administration Bureau, noted at a press conference. And, according to Ke Huanzhan, there is only an area of 20 square km left available for construction in the city.

The capital's newspaper BEIJING RIBAO carried a series of articles devoted to the prospects of erecting high-rise structures in Beijing, thus saving ground area that is in short supply. The newspaper's economists calculated that a 5-6 story building on 1 hectare of land could provide 8,000-9,000 square meters of housing area.

A 15-story building would provide 20,000 square meters, and a 20-story building -- 45,000 square meters. But, BEIJING RIBAO adds, this is only in theory. The erection of high-rise housing is becoming increasingly problematic due to the shortage of electricity, construction materials, and capital investment funds, and primarily the acute shortage of water.

The water supply problem from which the PRC capital suffers could become even more serious by the end of the present century, according to forecasts by Chinese research workers. The point is that Beijing uses mainly underground water, whose level falls by an average of 2 meters every year due to intensive pumping. The underground water sources, the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO writes, are replenished by about 605 million metric tons of water annually as a result of atmospheric precipitation, while over 900 million metric tons are pumped out annually from the wells. The result, according to BEIJING RIBAO, is that water pressure in domestic pipes in many districts is so low that it finds it difficult to reach the third story, while there is often no water at all during the dry season.

In order to alleviate the problem it has been decided to correct the mistake committed by the medieval architects. According to the general plan for Beijing's development, it is intended to accelerate the construction of satellite cities for the capital and to considerably expand housing construction in the suburbs.

In the municipal government's opinion, an experiment involving sales of apartments to workers and employees ought to yield additional funds for housing construction. This experiment was launched in January 1985. It is envisaged that those wishing to purchase an apartment could obtain from their employer enterprise or institution a subsidy covering up to two-thirds of the apartment cost. The remainder is to be paid by the purchaser either in a lump sum or by installments over a 10-year period. The subsidy is available only to those who are acquiring conventional apartments at the price of 300 yuans per square meter. Purchasers of more expensive apartments must pay the full cost. Any organizations undertaking housing construction in the capital are obliged to allocate 20 percent of apartments for sale to their employees.

The plan is for about 80 PRC cities to join this experiment, including giant cities like Shanghai and Tianjin. The housing problem is perhaps even more acute there -- according to some data, Shanghai with its 12 million population has just 3 square meters per capita on average.

The funds obtained from the sale of apartments will be used for new housing construction. It was noted at the all-China discussion on urban and rural construction held recently in Beijing that during the Seventh 5-Year Plan period (1986-1990) the PRC will build a total area of 750 million square meters of housing, in other words 130 million more than during the preceding 5-year plan period. According to Laian Zhong, vice minister of urban and rural construction and environmental protection, housing area available per capita of urban population will reach 6 [square] meters by 1990....

PRC CHIEF METEOROLOGIST VISITS 7-17 FEB

LD191338 Moscow TASS in English 1304 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 19 TASS -- A Chinese delegation, led by head of the State Meteorological Agency of the People's Republic of China Zou Jingmang stayed in the Soviet Union on February 7-17. The delegation was received by Yuriy Izrayel, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Hydro-Meteorology and Monitoring the Natural Environment. An exchange of opinions was held on a broad range of questions concerning the further development of cooperation between the USSR and the People's Republic of China in the respective areas.

MANEUVERS REVEAL JAPANESE MILITARY 'AMBITIONS'

LD222352 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1400 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Excerpts] Joint land maneuvers by U.S. troops and Japanese Self-Defense Forces have started in several parts of Hokkaido. The so-called Green Berets from Okinawa and U.S. contingents deployed in Hawaii have been ferried there to practice operations in heavy snowfall conditions. These are the second of its kind winter exercises in Hokkaido. The first exercises involving U.S. Marine Corps units were held last year. Coordination between U.S. and Japanese armed forces has been deepening and expanding on the basis of the so-called security treaty. The agreement is known to involve such aspects as intelligence exchange, joint manuevers, and construction of new U.S. military bases on Japan's territory.

By offering his country's territory for holding maneuvers and building military bases the Nakasone government is going further along the path of turning Japan into an outpost of U.S. aggressive strategy in the region. In the meantime, the authorities fully [word indistinct] the general consensus of Japan's public, who stage an ever more active daily opposition to the build-up of U.S. military presence in the Japanese islands. The islanders of Miyake, who are opposed to the construction of a base for the U.S. 7th Fleet Air Force, set up one precedent of the current situation. They are all against the idea of giving their land away to serve as an outpost of war and aggression. The authorities, however, have been trying to force the islanders to yield their land by brazen financial blackmail, saying they would ladle out the money for restoring the island's economy, which suffered in the wake of a volcano eruption, when they receive the islanders' consent to the construction of a base. Meanwhile, the islanders are not going to yield to pressure by the authorities.

It is hard to forecast the outcome of the confrontation between the islanders and the authorities, however facts show Tokyo continues its line of the expansion of the U.S. military presence in Japan. Recently, a major electronic surveillance base at Wakkanai, Honshu Island, was provided for the Pentagon and U.S. intelligence. The equipment, allowing no access for Japan's armed force personnel, has already been installed at the base. The equipment is being serviced by U.S. experts.

It is not only the build up of political pressure by the United States which accounts for the preparedness which Japanese ruling circles show in leasing their country's territory to the Pentagon strategists. Japan's leadership links the expansion of the U.S. military presence with the implementation of its own ambitions, aimed at the revival of Japan's military might.

U.S. 'SPY PLANES' INTRUDE INTO DPRK AIRSPACE

LD211852 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Pyongyang, February 21 TASS -- As was reported by the Central Telegraph Agency of Korea, American spy planes SR-71 today intruded twice into the airspace of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea over its territorial waters in the Sea of Japan and the Yellow Sea. Such flights took place on February 14, 17 and 20. The danger of these acts of air espionage is that they are taking place in the area of the Korean peninsula now that large-scale American-South Korean "Team Spirit-86" exercises are under way, involving big contingents of troops and a huge number of weapons.

U.S., NOT USSR, BLOCKING SETTLEMENT IN DRA

LD240053 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Another hot spot on earth: Afghanistan. During pointed discussions at the Geneva summit meeting, President Reagan accused the Soviet Union of not wanting, as he said, a political settlement in Afghanistan. The head of the White House, however, has shown by facts that it is his own administration that is doing everything to block a political settlement. Washington is building up military aid to the dushmans and is banking on expanding the undeclared war. Nonetheless, as Comrade Babrak Karmal stressed in an interview with the British paper THE GUARDIAN, the Afghan Government does not intend to request the Soviet Union increase the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan in response to the intensifying U.S. military interference.

The combat-readiness of the Afghan Army is strengthening, and the social base of people's power is also becoming broader. Many nonparty officials are members of the country's government and the Revolutionary Council. For a long time the important changes taking place in Afghanistan were virtually unknown to the public in the West. The bourgeois press preferred to broadcast reports from the other side, so to speak, from dushmans' camps. The Government of Democratic Afghanistan, however, gives foreign journalists the opportunity to get to know the life of the Afghan people.

BALUCHISTAN POVERTY LINKED TO U.S. MILITARY BASES

LD191149 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 18 Feb 86

[Aleksandr Malik commentary]

[Text] The subject of this commentary was prompted by a letter from four young people from Turbat town in Baluchistan. They say: We Baluchis live in the dark because we are deprived of basic human rights.

What made them write to us? Looking through an issue of the PAKISTAN TIMES recently I noticed an interview with the finance minister, Mahbubul Haq. The man in charge of planning the economic and social development of Pakistan complained that the people groundlessly reproached the regime for the absence of diverting attention to their needs and rights. The minister tried to back his opinion by statistics, by the increase of spending on the development of Baluchistan, for one. That is how the interview with the minister and the letter from four young men from Baluchistan appeared on my desk simultaneously. The two documents deal with the same subject. They can be compared, but they cannot be reconciled. Judge for yourself.

The senders of the letter don't simply reproach, as Mahbubul Haq puts it, but charge the regime with the fact that most Baluchis live in horrible poverty. There is no electricity or running water in their homes; their children can't receive even primary education. The young men say if there happens to be a school somewhere, there are no teachers, but if there are teachers there is no building suitable for a school. The Galuchis who have managed to learn to read and write and want to continue their education are subjected to real discrimination. They are actually barred from higher education because on various pretexts Baluchis are not allowed to have even entrance examinations to colleges.

The absence of necessary skills deprives them of the hope to find a job. Unemployment in Baluchistan grows faster than in the rest of the country. According to official reports, which many experts consider minimized, over one-fifth of Baluchis are out of work.

But Baluchis are not deprived only of their economic rights. The letter from our listeners makes it clear that the regime denies them the right to be masters in their own homes, openly express their opinions and observe their traditions and customs. Any manifestation of dissatisfaction is brutally suppressed. Our correspondents from Baluchistan say that the Pakistani authorities were especially merciless to participants in the actions demanding the restoration of democracy in July 1981. Thousands of Baluchis were killed or tortured. Their houses were levelled by bulldozers like the dwellings of the Pushtuns are now. The only part of the Baluchi population to which Islamabad is well disposed are the businessmen and big landlords, the owners of mines and plants. The Pakistani magazine HERALD says it's not accidental that they represent Baluchistan in the National Assembly.

Our listeners from Baluchistan report certain progress in the province in the past few years. Unfortunately, they don't mean economic, social or democratic rights. Progress is registered in an absolutely different sphere -- the military development of the province. People are moved out by force from Gwadar, Madakh, Hoshab and other settlements to clear the place for the construction of military bases and airfields. The zones are fenced off with barbed wire and announced closed. Guards are put around them.

This is done under the pressure of the United States, that thinks the Baluchistan can be a suitable staging post for the Rapid Deployment Force. The United States also hopes to control the approaches to the Persian Gulf through the network of its bases there. The facts are confirmed by numerous press reports and prominent Baluchi figures.

The former chief minister of the province, Attaulla Mengal, has told the British NEW STATESMAN magazine that the Pentagon is making use of seven bases and other military facilities in Baluchistan. The facilities are supposed to be placed under CENTCOM, the Central Command of the United States. However, Baluchis don't want the developments to proceed according to the American script.

This opposition is clearly seen in the letter from our listeners. It was expressed at a meeting of border tribes, that declared they would not permit the transformation of Baluchistan into a bridgehead of aggression against neighboring states. Attaulla Mengal said Baluchis no longer believed the oaths made by the Pakistani authorities on the Koran because they saw the endless brutal actions of the army and complete ignorance of their persistent demands to improve life, and observe their traditional rights and customs. That statement was made by a man who enjoys great authority among the Baluchis.

REPORTAGE, COMMENT ON PHILIPPINE DEVELOPMENTS

U.S. 'Intervention' Condemned

LD211044 Moscow TASS in English 0905 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 21 TASS -- Filipino Premier and Finance Minister Cesar Virata has condemned U.S. intervention in the internal affairs of the Philippines, intervention which, according to him, became especially gross during the preparations for and holding of presidential elections of February 7. Addressing a press conference here, Virata said that, having arrogated to itself the right to dictate to the Filipino leadership, Washington was making extensive use of economic levers to exert political pressure on the administration of President Marcos. Today, according to the Filipino prime minister, the United States demands from the Marcos government deep-going domestic reforms, threatening to cut financial aid given to the Philippines by the U.S. Government and also by the U.S.-controlled International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Marcos Cited on Rebellion

LD221853 Mocow TASS in English 1837 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] London, February 22 TASS -- Philippines President Ferdinand Marcos today told the country in a televised address that a plot to oust and kill him had been uncovered. REUTER reports from Manila that Marcos said National Defence Minister Juan Ponce Enrile and Deputy Chief of Staff Fidel Ramos were implicated in the conspiracy. According to the president, the other senior military commanders remained loyal to the government and were ordered to crush the conspiracy. He called upon the plotters to surrender to avoid unnecessary bloodshed. Marcos stressed that his government and himself were in complete control of the situation in the country.

Some time earlier Enrile and Ramos, supported by some military units, had seized the building of the Defense Ministry and announced at a press conference that they were "breaking up with Marcos." Enrile added that he had informed of this decision the U.S. ambassador to the Philippines, S. Bosworth.

Washington February 22 TASS -- A White House spokesman said today that the U.S. Administration was informed on the situation in the Philippines and followed the developments there.

'Peaceful Means' 'Exhausted'

LD231959 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 23 TASS -- President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines has made a statement disclosing the formation of a new anti-government group bent on seizing power. The group is led by National Defence Minister Enrile and Deputy Chief of the General Staff Ramos.

It was these individuals, the president said, who attempted to stage a coup yesterday. The plotters set up a state council comprising representatives of the opposition, military and business circles. The president said that peaceful means to find a way out of the present situation have been exhausted.

Marcos Stance; U.S. 'Interference'

LD231922 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1337 GMT 23 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, 23 Feb (TASS) -- Filipinos are waiting in suspense for the turn that events might take following yesterday's attempt to assassinate the president, which was preceded by a statement by J.P. Enrile, minister of national defense, and F. Ramos, deputy chief of staff of the Armed Forces, saying that they are "breaking off with Marcos." Streets leading to the presidential palace are blocked with barbed wire and military helicopters are patrolling the skies over the city. Units loyal to the government have been deployed around Camp Aguinaldo, where troops, headed by Enrile and Ramos, took cover. A dense crowd consisting of thousands of supporters of C. Aquino, leader of the opposition, who have been arriving here since morning, has encircled the camp.

In this critical situation, President F. Marcos held a press conference this morning. Speaking to local and foreign reporters, he informed them about uncovering a plot aimed at toppling the government. Three officers present at the press conference, who had been arrested on charges of taking part in the plot, admitted that the plan included the capture of the presidential palace and the physical removal of F. Marcos.

Answering questions from journalists, F. Marcos declared that the Philippine Armed Forces under his direct command remained loyal to the government, which was keeping the situation in the country under its full control. The president warned that should street fighting break out in Manila, he would immediately impose a curfew. The president urged the United States to refrain from "interference" in the Philippine events. At the same time, he expressed the hope that intervention will not be used against the Philippines. The head of the government confirmed that his inauguration ceremony would take place next Tuesday.

Meanwhile, Ramos and Enrile, as reported by information services, have refused to lay down arms as demanded by F. Marcos suggesting that he resign and make a place for the opposition leader, C. Aquino. "We shall not surrender, because the Philippine people stand behind us," they declared. Ramos and Enrile, as well as the Catholic Church, which has supported their plight, are periodically broadcasting appeals to the Philippine people.

As reported by AP, C. Aquino has curtailed her tour of the country and is en route to Manila. According to other reports, she has gone into hiding on the Philippine Island of Sebu, fearing arrest.

In these difficult days, the Philippines are literally in the sights of U.S. guns: The Pentagon has sent the flag ship of the 7th Fleet, Blue Ridge, and the aircraft carrier Midway to the shores of this island country and has transferred units of Marines from the rapid deployment forces and 300 Green Berets who are experts in conducting punitive operations against civil populations. Simultaneously, the Philippines have been flooded with various "advisers" and "observers" who, as the local press believes, have been doing regular "arm twisting." A special role has been assigned to P. Habib, special representative of R. Reagan, who has arrived in the Philippines allegedly on a "peace-making mission," but actually it is to exert crude pressure on that sovereign country. Political observers and news agency correspondents are paying attention to the fact that during his stay in Manila, Washington's emissary has had meetings with Ramos and Enrile.

Washington, 23 Feb (TASS) -- The White House has issued a statement which says, in particular, that Enrile, minister of national defense, and General Ramos, deputy chief of staff of the Philippine Armed Forces, have announced their withdrawal from the government. They have called upon Marcos to resign, insofar as, in their words, his government no longer has the mandate of the people.

"The Reagan administration has exerted additional pressure on President Marcos, having published a statement supporting his opponents' claims," THE WASHINGTON POST writes today. "The United states has a lot at stake in the Philippines, including large U.S. investments and the two most important military bases in Asia for the Air Force and the Navy." P. Habib is returning from the Philippines and immediately upon his arrival in Washington he will present his report to President R. Reagan. According to the evidence of the U.S. NBC television company, he "knew in advance of the events which occurred in the Philippine Ministry of Defense." A French television correspondent agrees with this opinion, stressing that "in the United States they are not surprised at the attempt at a mini-putsch, which took place in the Philippines."

Reagan Statement Constitutes Interference

LD241125 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT 24 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, February 24 TASS -- The U.S. President has held a conference with members of the National Security Council at which Philip Habib, special representative of the President who had just returned from the Philippines, made a report. Upon the end of the conference Larry Speakes, spokesman for the White House, read out a statement of Reagan which constituted an attempt to interfere in the internal affairs of the Philippines and to openly bring pressure to bear on President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippines.

State of Emergency Declared

LD240543 Moscow TASS in English 0537 GMT 24 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 24 TASS -- Speaking on national television this morning, President Marcos of the Philippines declared a state of emergency in the country. He said that forces loyal to him had been ordered to use small arms against the insurgents who hold military camps Fort Aguinaldo and Camp Crane. The television broadcast was disrupted when opposition forces seized the TV station. General Fabian Ver who is in charge of operations against the insurgents said in a radio broadcast that government troops were getting ready for a new operation.

'Transitional Government' Formed

LD240910 Moscow TASS in English 0853 GMT 24 Feb 86

[Text] Manila, February 24 TASS -- According to reports from the Philippines, the situation there remains complex and tense. Former national defense minister Juan Ponce Enrile and deposed deputy chief of the General Staff Fidel Ramos say they have received assurances of support from the commanders of 13 military districts of the country, including the Manila district. They have announced the formation of a government headed by opposition leader Corazon Aquino. At the same time Minister of Public Information of the Philippines Gregorio Cendana has stated that the government of Ferdinand Marcos controls the situation in the country. Mrs Aquino has made a statement after being proclaimed head of a "transitional government". She has called upon her supporters to stage a massive demonstration in Manila.

Lomeyko Describes U.S. Interference

LD211358 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 21 TASS -- Head of the Press Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Vladimir Lomeyko has decribed U.S. actions in the Philippines as direct interference in the affairs of the sovereign state and an example of the manifestation of the policy of "neo-globalism".

He spoke at a press conference, "Soviet Peace Programme and Regional Conflict Situation", held at the press centre of the 27th CPSU Congress today.

According to official returns, Ferdinand Marcos won the elections in the Philippines. The results were confirmed by the National Assembly. The Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman stressed that the Philippine inhabitants alone can decide the destiny of their country, including the question of who should hold the supreme post in their state.

It is noteworthy that many political figures and the general public in that country resolutely reject interference in their internal affairs. There are more than enough grounds for their indignation. Crowds of overseas emissaries were sent into that country to monitor the elections. But why were the Blue Ridge, the flagship of the U.S. 7th Fleet, as well as the aircraft-carrier Midway, two thousand more marines from the Rapid Deployment Force and 200 Green Berets -- riot-control instructors, dispatched towards the Philippine coasts on the eve of the elections? One might think the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman observed,that the poll was taking place in a U.S. trust territory, rather than in a sovereign nation.

As to the Soviet Union, it builds its relations with all countries, including the Philippines, on the basis of non-interference in the internal affairs of each other, on the basis of respect and equality.

Philippine Elections Haunt U.S.

LD232246 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 23 Feb 86

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] In the Philippines, the election results have been counted up, but the political situation remains unclear. The leader of the opposition, Corazon Aquino, has announced that the officially declared results are invalid.

The situation has been complicated by an attempt at a military overthrow. It was undertaken by Philippine National Defense Minister Enrile and the deputy chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces, Lieutenant General Ramos. Along with the support of some troop subunits they seized the Ministry of Defense building and police headquarters and demanded that President Marcos leave his post.

At the same time, the president himself announced that other senior military chiefs were standing by the government. Marcos pointed out that his government is monitoring the situation in the country and proposed to the mutineers that they lay down their arms in order to avoid bloodshed.

It is typical that the conspirators informed the U.S. ambassador to the Philippines, Bosworth, of their actions first thing. I would not have been surprised to find out that the U.S. ambassador had been enlightened beforehand of the plot; such is the really too suspicious fuss that Washington has started around the Philippines. Dozens of U.S. observers have paid a visit to this country in recent days. Also there was the personal envoy of the White House, Habib, who tried to play the role of the mediator in Manila between the government and the opposition.

But the U.S. Senate has unanimously adopted a resolution essentially declaring that it does not acknowledge the Filipino election results, a case almost unprecedented in international relations. This demonstrative gesture of course inspired the conspirators.

According to the British FINANCIAL TIMES the White House is haunted by the nightmare of the Philippine elections. It would be naive, however, to assume that in Washington they are chastely preoccupied with violations of the voting procedure. For the U.S. Administration, it is not very important who has won the elections -- Marcos or Aquino. The main thing is keeping U.S. bases in this country. Reagan himself blabbed this out while speaking at a press conference. It is impossible to lessen the significance of the bases not only for us, but for the Western world, he said. The Philippines without U.S. bases -- this is the nightmare haunting the White House.

Pressure Reaches 'Climax'

PM211253 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 First Edition p 5

[Pavel Demchenko "Commentator's Column": "Behind the Smoke Screen of Blackmail"]

[Text] No longer is anyone amazed by Washington's interference in the affairs of others. Congressmen, senators, and diplomats often try to instruct the leaders of other countries in how they should conduct themselves and even try to decide what results a certain election should have. And demonstrations of military might are made so that this "advice" and these "recommendations" are heeded, in other words, military pressure is exerted on the "disobedient" and "obstinate."

However, what is happening now concerning the Philippines, it seems, has exceeded the usual limits. We remind you that on the eve of this insular republic's presidential elections, a few hundred U.S. "observers" turned up in Manila and the aircraft carrier Enterprise and other warships with landing forces on board appeared off its shores. The U.S. President then sent to the Philippines his personal representative P. Habib, the same one who organized the political screen for the landing of Marines in Lebanon. But the matter did not end there. Pressure on the Philippines is currently reaching a climax and even more powerful artillery is entering the battle. The U.S. Senate has adopted a resolution which in essence declares that it does not recognize the results of the 7 February elections and calls on President Reagan to take appropriate measures.

is done as if it is a question of U.S. state or county and not at all a sovereign country and member of the United Nations. Whether the elections were good or bad is in the final analysis a matter for the country itself and its people. "Does President Reagan not understand," the newspaper MALAYA wrote, "that the Philippine people themselves must solve their own problems without outside interference!" But these appeals -- there have been many in the past and there are many now -- have not been heard. One can understand why. Subic Bay and Clark Field, two of the largest military bases outside the United States, are located on Philippine soil. More than 160 major U.S. firms and banks have based themselves in the Philippines. It is most important for Washington to preserve this; it is primarily concerned about the interests of the Pentagon and big business. This is the main thing; everything else recedes into the background.

The arguments about "defending democracy," the struggle against corruption, and the concern for justice are only camouflage, a propaganda screen for Washington's basic political goal: to keep its positions in the Philippines and to ensure tools of pressure on a country where events have recently developed that are patently not in the U.S. favor. This is precisely why the U.S. corridors of power are worrying, entire detachments of "arm-twisting" experts have been cast into the Philippines, and the forces Pentagon have begun to act. This is the latest example of interference in the internal affairs of another country and a display of U.S. imperialist manners within the framework of the "new globalism," that is already being conducted by the country's ruling circles in various parts of the world.

CSSR'S HUSAK SUPPORTS SOVIET ARMS PROPOSALS

PM211018 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Call of the Time"]

[Text] Prague, 17 Feb -- The prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and the peaceful resolution of all international problems are the insistent call of the time, G. Husak, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, stated in a speech at the Prague City CPCZ organization report and election conference.

In a number of areas of the globe, the Czechoslovak leader continued, the sparks of military conflicts are smoldering and mountains of mass destruction weapons, which threaten to destroy human civilization, have been accumulated in the world. The Soviet Union, showing a sense of responsibility for the planet's future, has put forward a wide-ranging program aimed at reducing and entirely eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the year 2000. However, certain circles in the United States are trying, on various pretexts, to cast doubt on these realistic proposals and avoid specifically replying to them. They are continuing to strive for domination over the world, and the military-industrial complex in the United States does not want to abandon the immense profits which the arms race brings it.

The Czechoslovak people are well aware how deeply the questions of war and peace concern their vital interests. That is why they fully support the peace-loving Soviet initiatives. The tragic experience of our history and the price paid for the country's freedom and independence remind us that only in alliance with the USSR and all the socialist community countries is it possible to ensure the CSSR's peaceful development.

It can be stated with satisfaction that the USSR's peace-loving proposals are meeting with growing international support. There is a strengthening conviction in the world of the need to resolve international security questions on the basis of the principles proposed by the Soviet Union. This gives us hope that it will be possible to avert the nuclear threat and ensure a peaceful future for mankind, the speaker said in conclusion.

PRAVDA CARRIES RYZHKOV, MESSNER DINNER SPEECHES

Ryzhkov Speech

PM211130 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on speech by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at 19 February Kremlin dinner in honor of Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, under general heading "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] The official friendly visit to the Soviet Union of the chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers is an important event in Soviet-Polish relations, N.I. Ryzhkov said. In cordially greeting the head of the Polish Government, at the same time we would like to express our respect for the fraternal people of socialist Poland and the PZPR, our comrade-in-arms in our common cause, the struggle for socialism and peace.

We have had a detailed exchange of views today on a wide range of questions of interest to both sides. This applies to both bilateral cooperation and international problems.

We highly appreciate the mutual understanding and unity of views which were revealed during the talks and which enable us to elaborate joint decisions and find new ways and forms of cooperation in the interests of accelerating our progress and enhancing the well-being of both countries' peoples. We have completed our work by signing new Soviet-Polish agreements.

All this is based on the tremendous and constant efforts of our fraternal parties' Central Committees and both countries' governments, aimed at further deepening Soviet-Polish friendship and all-around cooperation. The meetings between Comrade M.S. Gorbachev and Comrade W. Jaruzelski and the accords which they reached on fundamental questions of Soviet-Polish relations have added new scope and dynamism to this process.

Today, on the eve of the 27th CPSU Congress, we are particularly strongly aware of the leading and inspiring role played by the Communist Party. The congress will define the main goals of the creative activity of Soviet people in all spheres. The strategic concept which determines our progress is based on the acceleration of socioeconomic development and an upsurge of the creative activeness of all Soviet people.

We are convinced that the bracing atmosphere of creativity which has been created by the the party, and confidence that the set aims will be achieved, will continue to have an increasing impact and will bear fruit in all areas and every sphere, including cooperation with fraternal Poland.

We believe in our cooperation. And this belief is bolstered by historical experience and our common, immutable political values. During the years of Poland's difficult trials our parties and our peoples pooled their efforts even more closely. We note with great satisfaction today that socialist Poland is surmounting its difficulties; in the course of preparations for its 10th Congress, the PZPR's links with the masses are strengthening.

Today, while discussing questions of Soviet-Polish cooperation during the new 5-year plan, we paid particular attention to new forms of economic relations capable of enhancing the effectiveness of these relations. These trends include production sharing and specialization, the expansion of direct links between industrial enterprises, and deepening socialist economic integration in every way. Special importance attaches to joint efforts to implement the Comprehensive Program for the CEMA Member Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000. They will help to accelerate the socioeconomic development of the socialist community countries and strengthen their unity and cohesion.

This is of tremendous importance in the current complex international situation. On a worldwide scale, the unity of the socialist countries serves a great goal on all continents and inspiring them to vigorous action. This goal is to prevent a nuclear catastrophe for the sake of preserving life on earth. And if today real preconditions for reducing the threat of war and reviving detente are emerging, we are able to say with great satisfaction that this is happening thanks to the fraternal socialist countries' persistent efforts and thanks to their cohesion and will for peace.

In accordance with the socialist community's common strategic course toward a decisive breakthrough from confrontation to cooperation, the Soviet Union has put forward a radical and at the same time realistic program which envisages the complete and universal elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 on the condition that the creation [sozdaniye], testing, and deployment of space strike weapons are banned.

This program, set forth in the 15 January statement of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has opened up a reliable way toward delivering mankind from the threat of destruction.

Our program is designed to give a powerful impetus to the disarmament process in all its aspects. Priority tasks include ridding the European Continent of nuclear missile stockpiles, both tactical and medium-range, located there. The first step should be the elimination of all U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles -- ballistic and cruise missiles -- from the European zone, as proposed by us. The Soviet Union and Poland are actively cooperating in questions of foreign policy and the solution of current international problems. We highly appreciate the support expressed for the new Soviet peace initiatives by the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and the Polish Government and Sejm. For our part, we note with satisfaction Poland's substantial contribution to our common struggle to prevent the militarization of space, to curb the arms race, and for disarmament. We express confidence that the cooperation between Poland and the Soviet Union in the international arena will continue reliably to serve the cause of peace, the strengthening of trust between states, and the broad development of equitable and mutually advantageous cooperation between them.

We wish the PZPR, its Central Committee, the Polish Government, and all fraternal Poland's working people new success in socialist building.

Allow me to assure you on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government that we will continue to spare no efforts to further strengthen the close cooperation between the CPSU and the PZPR and between our countries' governments, and to deepen the fraternal friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Polish Peoples' Republic.

Messner Address

PM211353 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report on Z. Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, reply speech at 19 February Kremlin dinner in his honor under general heading "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude for your hospitality, cordial welcome, and the frank and concrete talks which proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding, Z. Messner said. I value particularly highly the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The decisions adopted are of fundamental importance for Poland's development and the implementation of key socioeconomic tasks. The talks revealed the unity of the aims pursued by our Marxist-Leninist parties and our socialist states. They have reaffirmed that our friendship and the Polish-Soviet alliance are based on the indestructible principles of internationalism and on the common interests of the two fraternal peoples.

The Polish public is closely following the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress, which is due to open within the next few days and which will be a major event in the life of the Land of the Soviets, the socialist community, and the entire international communist and workers movement. The bold plans and programs contained in the draft documents of the congress deserve the highest admiration. They testify to the achievements of the party of Soviet Communists and the creative development of Marxism-Leninism.

Polish Communists share the ideals and thoughts expressed in the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program. It is a work of colossal dimensions, whose horizons reach out to the 21st century, a work of exceptional importance for the entire socialist system.

The 10th PZPR Congress will be a great event in the life of the Polish people. It will adopt our party program which reaches far into the future for the first time, and it will map out the trends and tasks of socialist development in People's Poland.

A common feature of the draft programs of both our fraternal parties is that they place social aims and the working people's well-being in the forefront. This is because they determine the meaning of socialist transformations.

An indispensable precondition of improving society's material and spiritual life is the growth of production forces and of the productivity of social labor.

We regard the achievement of substantial progress in the development and modernization of the economy, acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and broader participation in the international division of labor as a way to attain this aim.

These plans are in keeping with development trends in the entire socialist community. We proved this here in Moscow a few weeks ago, when we adopted documents which open up a qualitatively new stage of cooperation within the framework of CEMA.

The implementation of these plans in our country, particularly in the next 5-year plan, represents a complex task; the scale of our difficulties considerably exceeds that of other countries.

We are aware of the objective causes hampering the development of our economy: the state of the production potential, disproportions in the internal structure of the economy, the burden of debts and the unprecedented economic sanctions against us by capitalist countries, hostile propaganda aggression, and the attempts to isolate us in the international arena.

However, the correctness of the chosen path is indisputable. It is borne out by the ongoing normalization of political and socioeconomic life, the growing prestige of the party and state organs, and the strengthening of the positions of socialism in our country. We will continue to advance down the path with utmost consistency.

Expansion of all-around cooperation with the Soviet Union is of fundamental importance for Poland's further socioeconomic development. This was cogently expressed by W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish State Council, when he said that Poland "...seeks to develop and enrich cooperation with the great Land of the Soviets in all spheres. We share the view that further quantitative and qualitative progress in this cooperation is essential."

Polish-Soviet economic relations are producing increasing benefits for our countries. In recent years we have created a solid basis for their further development in the shape of the Long-Term Program for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation Through the Year 2000.

This is finding expression in the results of the coordination of the plans for 1986-1990, and also in the development of existing forms, methods, and trends of economic cooperation and in the quest for new ones, such as the development of direct contacts between industrial enterprises and organizations, the establishment of joint enterprises, the Soviet Union's participation in the modernization of Polish production capacities, and the establishment of joint scientific research teams, design bureaus, and laboratories.

We share the view that in many spheres there are still great additional potentials and reserves. We believe that our current talks and the signed treaties and agreements will also help to exploit them better.

Polish-Soviet cooperation is not only developing dynamically in the economy. Links between enterprise collectives, contacts between trade union and youth organizations, friendship societies, and other mass public organizations are expanding. Cultural and scientific exchanges are developing successfully.

The successess achieved in the development of Polish-Soviet relations are based on the close interaction between the PZPR and the CPSU. Of particular importance are the meetings between Comrades W. Jaruzelski and M.S. Gorbachev, and also meetings between members of the leadership of the two fraternal parties. We would like to continue to strengthen and expand this interaction in the interests of both our parties, countries, and peoples.

The friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union guarantees Poland's security and the inviolability of our borders.

The indestructible alliance between Poland and the USSR also serves the interests of the Soviet Union and helps to ensure the security of the Land of the Soviets and its development.

The Polish people fully support the Leninist peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union. We express our complete solidarity with the Soviet disarmament initiatives, and in particular with the far-reaching program for delivering mankind from a nuclear catastrophe which was put forward by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev.

We cannot remain indifferent to facts indicating that the United States and its NATO allies continue to seek military superiority over the socialist community countries and to pursue their policy of confrontation. This creates favorable conditions for the activities of forces, particularly in the FRG, which would like to turn back the wheel of history and undermine existing territorial and political realities in Europe.

Understandably, we will continue to consistently strengthen our defensive alliance, the Warsaw Pact, which serves as a reliable shield in protecting the security of the fraternal socialist states and upholding peace in Europe and throughout the world.

We are confronting enormous tasks whose solution will mark an important step forward in socialist building, the strengthening of our states' security, and upholding peace.

Allow me to express my firm belief that new unfading values will be added to the rich treasure house of Polish-Soviet friendship.

Z. Messner proclaimed a toast in honor of our Marxist-Leninist parties -- the CPSU and the PZPR -- and their Central Committees and wished health and success to Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and W. Jaruzelski, Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, and all who attended the dinner.

The guest expressed himself in favor of indestructible friendship and cooperation between our countries and peoples and wished success to our common struggle for peace, progress, and socialism.

MESSNER SEEN OFF AT AIRPORT DEPARTURE CEREMONY

PM241038 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 4

[TASS report: "Visit Ends"]

[Excerpt] Zbigniew Messner, member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, left Moscow 20 February. He had been in our country on an official friendly visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

At the airport the guest was seen off at the aircraft ramp by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and G.A. Aliyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The farewell ceremony was also attended by A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; M.S. Smirtyukov, administrator of affairs of the USSR Council of Ministers; USSR Ministers B.I. Aristov, B.V. Balmont, Tb.B. Guzhenko, A.S. Systsov, and V.G. Chirskov; USSR State Committee Chairmen A.N. Aksenov and K.F. Katushev; S.A. Losev, director general of TASS; O.B. Rakhmanin, chief of a CPSU Central Committee Department; V.P. Lakhtin, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan; V.P. Loginov, USSR deputy foreign minister; V.T. Saykin, chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom; V.I. Brovikov, USSR ambassador to Poland; and other officials.

W. Natorf, Polish ambassador to the USSR, and representatives of Moscow's working people were also in the sendoff party.

The state flags of the Polish People's Republic and the USSR were flying at the airport and an honor guard from the Moscow garrison was lined up. A band played the state anthems of the two countries. N.I. Ryzhkov and Z. Messner inspected the line of Soviet servicemen. The festive ceremony ended with a march-past by the honor guard.

The Moscow streets and squares through which the motorcade, with its honorary motorcycle escort, passed on its way to the airport were decked out with the two countries' state flags and greetings banners.

UK RADAR STATION UPGRADE VIOLATES ABM TREATY

LD212239 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Sergey Sayenko commentary]

[Text] The United States decision to start modernizing this year the radar station at Fylingdales Moor draws Britain into the violation of the ABM treaty. Sergey Sayenko has written this commentary.

By its consent to modernize the radar station at Fylingdales Moor, Britain, along with the United States, has in fact taken another step toward undermining the Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems. In accordance with the treaty the Soviet Union and the United States agree not to set up such stations outside their national territories. So what is it? An occasional negligence on the part of the United States and Britain, a failure to realize that after the modernization of the radar facility at Fylingdales Moor it will considerably expand the range of its actions and the zone of surveillance?

Unlikely so. The matter is that the ABM treaty remains important and significant, and as usual strongly hinders attempts to upset the strategic parity in the world and achieve military superiority. One should bear in mind that the AMB treaty is a deterrent to an arms race in space. Before the Soviet-American summit in Geneva last November and after it London has repeatedly stressed the need for the United States and the Soviet Union to stand by the SALT II and ABM treaties. In them, if official signals are to be believed, London sees the guarantee of success at negotiations in Geneva. So it turns out that the right hand doesn't know what the left one does.

U.S. DICTATES FRG STANCE ON ARMS PROPOSALS

LD211644 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 21 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Aleksey Grigoryev writes:

"Consultations", "explanations" and other propagandistic lectures, by means of which Washington is busy manipulating its NATO allies in an attempt to bring them to a common denominator, obviously make themselves felt on the banks of the Rhine. At first, Bonn assured that it was "welcoming the stand" set out by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his statement of January 15, and promised together with the FRG's allies thoroughly to study the proposals and particularly the new elements contained in them whereas later on West German ruling circles began more and more obviously to adjust their positions to bring them into line with the U.S. ones.

To begin with, the Christian Liberal coalition abruptly about-faced in the question of a ban on nuclear tests and on nuclear weapons as such. Back at the beginning of January, when speaking in the Bundestag, Chancellor Helmut Kohl urged the USSR and the USA to introduce such a ban. Scarcely had two weeks passed after the Soviet Union put forward proposals aimed at ridding mankind of the nuclear threat when Lothar Ruehl, state secretary of the FRG's ministry of defence set out an official line of NATO circles and of the government at a meeting of the parliamentary commission on defence: a certain number of nuclear tests will be necessary as long as the NATO strategy envisages the use of these weapons of mass destruction.

The line became known during a debate in the Bundestag, which enabled SDPG deputies to draw a clear conclusion: Bonn, upon having given consent to participation in the U.S. "star wars" programme, which automatically means a continuation of nuclear weapon testing, has practically renounced a ban on such explosions.

The farther, the more. They on the Rhine are now trying to question the entire package of Soviet peace proposals by obstructing the way to their realisation with every kind of conditions.

When speaking at a press conference in Bonn after a regular West German-Italian consultative meeting, Chancellor Helmut Kohl of the FRG, upon having made a usual diplomatic gesture by saying that "the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva gave an impetus to progressive development which can be welcomed", stated that "zero option" on the question of medium-range nuclear missiles should not be limited to Europe but should also include without fail the "Soviet missiles deployed on the other side of the Urals". "A different settlement of the problem is not subject to discussion," Kohl maintained.

The U.S. origin of such a thesis is obvious. Reagan's "zero option" is known to have provided that the USSR was to eliminate its medium-range missiles not only in the European zone but in the country's east as well and, on the other hand, it does not rule out that the USA could transfer such missiles to its allies. Neither does it rule rule out that Britain and France could build up their respective nuclear arms. Of course, this is quite different from what the USSR is suggesting.

Thus, an obvious refusal to immediately ban nuclear explosions is manifest. Britain's and France's unequivocal hint at not agreeing to a freeze on their nuclear forces upon the elimination of Soviet-U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone is manifest, too, just as a demand for a simultaneous reduction in relevant Soviet weapons in Asia, the weapons which are a counterbalance to the U.S. nuclear potential existing there. Only in this way one can define Bonn's present-day stand with regard to the most pressing problems of our times. This is the stand which, really, was not worthwhile setting out in German because it had been repeatedly set out in English from Washington.

MISSING USSR EMBASSY STAFFER SOUGHT IN GREECE

NC201927 Athens ATHENS NEWS in English 20 Feb 86 p 4

[Text] Alternate Interior and Public Order Minister Athanasios Tsouras told the press that the authorities had not found any of the three Soviets who had been reported missing by the Soviet Embassy in Athens.

Mr Tsouras denied any knowledge of a protest by the U.S. Embassy over the Soviets discovered cruising around the embassy in two cars on Friday night.

No weapons or electronic equipment were found in the cars by police who took the cars' occupants in for questioning, after being alerted by the U.S. Embassy, he said.

Asked whether the missing Soviet citizens would be allowed out of Greece if they appeared at a border checkpoint, Mr Tsouras said that as missing persons for whom a search was under way they would be investigated, but if their travel documents were in order they "should not be hindered."

BOVIN STRESSES SENSELESSNESS OF GULF WAR

LD211224 Moscow TASS in English 1152 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, February 21 TASS -- From the Soviet Union's standpoint, the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq is needed neither by Tehran nor by Baghdad, political commentator Aleksandr Bovin said today. He explained that if anybody benefits from this war, it is first of all the enemies of Arab unity, the forces seeking to preserve tension in the Middle Eastern and Central Asian region. Bovin was speaking at a news conference in the press center of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which dealt with the theme "The Soviet Peace Program and Regional Conflict Situations".

The Iran-Iraq armed conflict is among the more senseless wars of the 20th century, the commentator said, adding that from the general humanistic point of view, the absurdity and senselessness of this war are obvious. Bovin also pointed out the irrationality of the stand taken by Tehran which stubbornly declares that the war will not end until the present political regime in Baghdad is removed. Plainly, with such an approach the war will go on for a long time, but those suffering from it in the first place are not the people who sit in Baghdad and Tehran but those who are engaged in the fighting, for the war has already claimed hundreds of thousands of lives.

The Soviet Union advocates a comprehensive approach to the resolution of the complicated and explosive problems of the times, which concern the situation in the Asian region, the news conference was told. The Soviet side believes that what is needed as a matter of priority is a dialogue among all nations and governments in that continent as well as unfailing respect for the independence and national sovereignty of each country.

IRAQI AMBASSADOR CONFERS WITH LUSHEV IN MOSCOW

JN211034 Baghdad INA in Arabic 0943 GMT 21 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow, 21 Feb (INA) -- The Iraqi ambassador to the Soviet Union met with Lushev, member of the International Relations Department of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and member of the CPSU Central Committee. The ambassador explained to Lushev developments in the Iraq-Iran war and the dangers this war poses to world peace and security, pointing out the dimensions and aims of the Iranian aggression which is a violation of the sovereignty of an independent state as well as a threat to the territory of other UN member-states. He called for condemning this aggression and for exerting efforts on all levels to end the Iraqi-Iranian conflict peacefully. The Soviet official expressed concern over the continuation of the war as a result of the recent Iranian aggression against Iraqi territory. He said that the Soviet Union is trying to put an end to the conflict, stressing that the continuation and expansion of the war will lead to foreign interference in the region which will serve Zionist interests and imperialist schemes in this part of the world.

GULF CONFLICT, YEMEN SITUATION EXAMINED

LD221455 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 22 Feb 86

[From the "Time, Events, People" program, with answers to listeners' questions by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Excerpts] Our mail contains a particularly large quantity of letters devoted to the forthcoming party congress and the program documents that it will discuss.

Moreover, a whole series of letters, in one form or another, repeat the thought that one of the most important topics is now the question of war and peace. Precisely for that reason, many of our listeners are particularly interested in the situation in the world's flashpoints which pose a threat to universal peace.

Let us now consider the situation in one such hotbead of tension -- in the Persian Gulf region, where the war between Iran and Iraq is now in its 6th year. (Askir Gassanzade) from Baku is interested in the origins of the conflict and the prospects for resolving it.

I would like to make the point that one of the main causes of the conflict is the age-old territorial dispute between the two states. The border between them along the Shatt al-'Arab river was established in the time of British domination in the region and did not suit either country. The latest treaty defining the border line between them was signed in 1975 under blatant pressure from the shah of Iran and was annulled by Iraq after his overthrow. However, all the frontier disputes could be settled if the imperialist forces did not have an interest in maintaining tension in that very important region, where there are enormous oil reserves.

The Soviet Union, on the contrary, has repeatedly called for a quick end to the conflict and for the settlement of disputes by political means around the negotiating table. Our country adopted this position during the recent meeting of the UN Security Council, which called for an end to the Iran-Iraq war, which is bringing to the peoples of both countries only casualties and devastation.

In conclusion, I would like to reply, albeit briefly, to letters from (Ivan Ivanovich Korniyevskiy) in Lipetsk, (Vladimir Mikhaylovich Moshchalgin) in the village of Verkhneozernoye in Orenburg Oblast and other listeners, who ask about the situation in the People's Democratic Republic of Yeman [PDRY].

As far as one can now judge, the recent bloody clashes in the country resulted from a split in the party and state leadership. Tribal and clan differences, vestiges of feudalism and the inflammatory actions of reactionary imperialist forces also had an effect. The situation in the country is now returning to normal. The first session of the newly-constituted Council of Ministers has taken place. Abu Bakr al-'Attas, the chairman of the Presidium of the Republic's Supreme People's Council, emphasized at it the importance of preserving a progressive system in the country. He gave a high appraisal to the friendly relations linking Democratic Yeman with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

PDRY MINISTER DISCUSSES SOVIET 'EXPERTS' RETURN

GF221854 Aden Domestic Service in Arabic 1630 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Brother Salih Abu Bakr ibn Husaynun, member of the YSP [Yemen Socialist Party] Central Committee, deputy prime minister and minister of energy and minerals, received in his office today Comrade Vladislav Zhukov, USSR ambassador to the PDRY. They discussed the aspects of economic cooperation between the two friendly countries in the field of energy and minerals and the means of promoting it. They also discussed the return of the Soviet experts working in this field. Brother ibn Husaynun explained to the brother ambassador the aims and dimensions of the abortive coupist conspiracy carried out by the schemer 'Ali Nasir and his clique.

The USSR ambassador expressed his country's willingness to strengthen cooperation between the two friendly countries in all fields in the light of the friendship and cooperation treaty signed between the two friendly peoples. He affirmed that the experts will return in the next few days.

SOVIET SOLIDARITY DELEGATION ARRIVES IN LIBYA

PM211638 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 86 Morning Edition p 5

[APN correspondent Ye. Aslanyan dispatch for IZVESTIYA: "Bonds of Solidarity"]

[Text] Tripoli -- The solidarity of the world public with Libya is becoming more extensive now that ships of the U.S. 6th Fleet are staging unending maneuvers and provocations off Libyan shores and the imperialists are trying to scare the 3-million-strong people of the North African country with the threat of invasion.

A delegation from the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Asian and African Countries headed by Professor K. Barlamov has just arrived here at the invitation of the National Committee for Peace and Afro-Asian Solidarity. Receiving the guests, Ahmad Shihadah, the well known politician and public figure, said: "We are grateful to the Soviet people for their support in this difficult time for us. I have visited the Soviet Union and met with Soviet people and I must say that we are using your experience of socialist building. We are confident that the 27th CPSU Congress that opens in a few days will allow the Soviet Union to scale new heights in developing all spheres of the economy."

SOVIET OFFICIAL VIEWS COOPERATION WITH KUWAIT

LD240943 Kuwait KUNA in English 0819 GMT 24 Feb 86

[By Khalid al-Tarrah]

[Text] Moscow, Feb 24 (KUNA) -- A senior Soviet official Monday described Kuwait's foreign policy as "wise and balanced" and characterized its role played in the international arena as "tangible and positive".

In an interview with KUNA, head of the Gulf Section at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Aleksandr Ivanov noted that Kuwait practices a non-aligned policy on both the international and local levels. Ivanov also expressed admiration and appreciation of Kuwait's role in the United Nations and other international bodies. "Kuwait plays a positive role on the international level especially relating to disarmament and ways of strengthening world peace and security". Kuwait with its small area, plays a (?tangible) and positive role" on the world level.

"I do not think that only the Soviet Union recognizes the peace-loving policy of Kuwait, but the entire world as well", Ivanov stressed.

Speaking on cultural cooperation between the two countries, Ivanov pointed out that cultural relations with Kuwait became more active last year compared with previous year citing the Kuwaiti labour union's participation in the 12th youth festival, the signing of a two-year cultural protocol and a number of exchange visits by ranking cultural delegations between the two sides.

Ivanov, who served in the Soviet diplomatic mission in Kuwait in the 1970s said there are plans underway to expand relations between the University of Moscow and University of Kuwait as well as with other scientific institutions in Kuwait such as the Kuwait Institute for Scientific Research (KISR).

On future military deals between Kuwait and the USSR, the Soviet diplomat said "first of all we are not arms dealers", however, we sell arms to those countries facing threats.

Military cooperation with Kuwait began mainly with the [word indistinct] to strengthen Kuwait's defence ability and not for any reason, [as received] Ivanov stressed. "We are ready to give military assistance to Kuwait only when it is requested by the government," he added.

On the recent Iranian offensive launched against Iraq, Ivanov described it as "the most violent one" since the eruption of war in 1980. He stressed that the aim of the recent thrust is strictly to isolate Iraq from neighboring countries of the Gulf region.

He also reiterated his country's clear and stable stand regarding the Gulf war, calling for an immediate end to the conflict. The Soviet Union is strongly opposed to occupation, Ivanov added. "The Soviet Union supports the right of the Gulf countries to protect their territories from any foreign intervention in the affairs of the region, the Soviet official concluded.

PLO OFFICIAL ENDS SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY TALKS

JN221838 Baghdad Voice of PLO in Arabic 1645 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Brother Abu Jihad [Khalil al-Wazir], deputy commander in chief of the Palestinian revolution forces, has concluded official talks with senior Soviet officials following a session with officials at the Soviet Foreign Ministry, the CPSU Central Committee, and the Afro-Asian Committee.

Brother Abu Jihad met with the Arab ambassadors at the PLO's office in the USSR last night. He briefed the ambassadors on recent developments in the Palestine question.

SYRIAN, SOVIET OIL RELATIONS, PROMOTION DISCUSSED

JN221356 Damascus SANA in Arabic 1335 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] Damascus, 22 Feb (SANA) -- Oil and Mineral Wealth Minister Dr Ghazi al-Durubi and Soviet ambassador Felix Fedotov discussed bilateral oil relations and ways to promote them. Receiving the ambassador here today, the minister stressed Syria's eagerness to promote these relations in the interest of the peoples in both friendly countries.

ENVOY BRIEFS AL-JUMAYYIL ON SOVIET STAND

NC241023 Beirut Domestic Service in Arabic 1000 GMT 24 Feb 86

[Text] Yuriy Suslikov, Soviet charge d'affaires in Lebanon, met with President Shaykh Amin al-Jumayyil today and briefed him on the Soviet answer to the proposals that the president presented on 10 February. Suslikov reiterated Soviet support for Lebanon and its people regarding southern Lebanon and the Israeli attacks on it.

U.S. MAY USE CHEMICAL WEAPONS AGAINST NICARAGUA

LD221116 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Lydia Podolnaya commentary]

[Text] As reported by HONDUPRESS, U.S. airplanes based in Honduras are scattering poisonous substances on the territory of the country.

Eye-witnesses told correspondents and agencies that every time following the appearance of U.S. Air Force planes there would be yellow rain; if it fell on the skin it caused severe burns and poisoning. It turned out that the poisonous chemical Agent Orange has exactly the same aftereffects; as is known, it was widely used by the U.S. military during the war in Vietnam, when hundreds of thousands of civilians suffered.

The Pentagon is now experimenting with chemical weapons in Honduras -- experimenting for the time being. One of the first victims was a peasant from the (Villa Nueva) settlement, (Sirio Flores). There have been so many complaints from the Cortes Department alone that the authorities have set up a special commission which has carried out an investigation and even prepared a report. However, one can only guess at its contents -- publication has been banned.

At the same time official Washington has once again got busy with disseminating slander about the Sandinists' use of chemical substances against the contras. In other words, the United States wants to cover up even more the traces of its own actions. This looks unconvincing. But then, I think it is appropriate to recall the Nicaraguan leaders' statement that the Pentagon is preparing for chemical and bacteriological war against the republic. Quite a lot of proof has been produced; for example, last year's outbreak of dengue fever. The epidemic struck over half a million people; that is virtually one inhabitant in every six in Nicaragua.

Vietnam and Cuba once suffered from this disease. The path they have chosen -- the path of building socialism -- did not suit U.S. ruling circles, and their disgrace cost the Cubans and the Vietnamese dearly. Among other means of punishment there have been chemical and bacteriological weapons. Tomorrow the same thing may be repeated against Nicaragua.